LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSTOWN

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXVI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26 NUMBER 1246

After Munich (Continued)

People who live in earthquake countries know that a bad shock is usually followed for days or weeks by others of gradually lessening severity. That is what is happening after the "peace" of Munich. A dozen fundamental changes are taking place, any one of which would normally make headlines for many months.

What is left of Czechoslovakia is now completely under German tutelage. Hitler has announced, in the curious Nazi terminology, that the Czechs will henceforth be "loyal" to the German Reich. The Masonic orders are being disbanded; communism will probably be made illegal; compulsory labor camps, German style, have been started. When the Hungarians massed their troops on the Czech border, it was to Berlin and Rome that Prague appealed, ignoring Paris and London. The Hungarians will get a fat slice of Slovak territory, but not a continuous border with Poland, which would cut Czechoslovakia in two.

Success has not mellowed the German Nazis. Their press, of course under government orders, has launched a campaign of abuse against English opponents of the Munich settlement. Germany practically orders England not to appoint to office such men as Winston Churchill, Anthony Eden or Duff Cooper. She coolly proposes a permanent inferiority in the air for England of one to three, and thereby endangers the present naval agreement, which is just the reverse. Suggestions that America now needs a vast armament program have also angered Berlin. What's sauce for the wolf is evidently not sauce for the lamb.

One of the gravest of the minor shocks after Munich is Palestine. The Arabs there have obviously decided that Great Britain, having shown her weakness, should be pressed hard. We do not doubt that Germany and Italy are helping them in every possible way, though it would be wrong to assume that the revolt is solely the creation of these powers. Reports that Great Britain might suspend or curtail Jewish immigration to Palestine has brought a flood of bitter protests from Jews throughout the world. Secretary Hull has strongly hinted that the United States must be consulted under the agreement of 1924, and will object to any such action.

The tragic fact is that since Munich, a Jewish state in Palestine that depends on British bayonets for its existence is in constant grave peril. England's position throughout the Mediterranean is enormously weakened. Germany will dominate all southeastern Europe, including Greece and Turkey. To protect Jewish Palestine even against the Arabs England needs at least 50 percent more than her present force of 22,000 men. Against the Arabs backed by Germany and Italy, it is problematical how many she needs or whether she can maintain her position at all. The matter is far more complicated and serious than merely observing the pledge contained in the Balfour Declaration.

Munich is also reverberating in the Far East, where Japan has defied England, ignored her protest and launched a major attack upon Canton. A success there not only means a serious blow at the Chinese resistance at Hankow, but makes the position of the British in

CONTENTS

The Week 317

Editorials

Investigate the State Department 319
Wage Cuts for Looted Railroads 321

General Articles

Europe: Four Views . . H. N. Brailsford, Frank C. Hanighen, Henry C. Wolfe and Frederick L. Schuman 322
Barton, Barton, Barton and Barton . . . . . George Seldes 327
Due Process of Law . . . Samuel Slaff 329
Shoot the Works . . . Heywood Broun 331
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 332
Other People's Money . . John T. Flynn 333
Biography and Theatre . . . Stark Young 334
The Bandwagon 335

Correspondence 335

Books in Review

Tribute to Ben Franklin . Malcolm Cowley 338
A History of Writing . . John Peale Bishop 339
Anatomy of a City . . . Robert M. Coates 340
Behind War in China . . Ernest O. Hauser 341
The Revolutionary Governess . Edmund Wilson 342
New Books: A Reader's List 343

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1938, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

Hong Kong tenable only under Japanese sufferance.

Munich's shadow is cast over Spain as well. Mussolini having made his token withdrawal of 10,000 weary veterans, although many thousands more still remain, we may expect Mr. Chamberlain with all haste to put the Anglo-Italian agreement into effect. M. Daladier is almost equally eager to bring the Spanish war to an end no matter how, and will coöperate in the most brutal coercion upon the Loyalists. Although Premier Negrín has repudiated any compromise solution, the future looks dark. This is not true in a military sense, since the Loyalist forces have of late maintained a clear superiority in the field.

The crashing of Europe's walls after Munich has been heard across the Atlantic. Many voices in America have been raised to say that the security we have enjoyed because of the balance of power in Europe and England's naval strength no longer exists. President Roosevelt has announced he will restudy our entire armament question. Bernard M. Baruch says we have a grave inferiority in equipment and plant. The notion seems to be gaining ground that we must prepare, with a little aid from Latin America, to defend this entire hemisphere. Before long, it seems likely we shall look back with envy on the good old days of 1938 when we spent only a billion and a quarter on armament.

Where Were Chamberlain's Weapons?

When Chamberlain came to power in Great Britain, he did so largely on the basis of a pledge to rearm and make the country safe against possible war. Labor objected to this policy, not because it was against military strength, but because it did not trust Tory leadership to use the power for democratic purposes. But Chamberlain won and has since spent enormous sums in his rearmament program, imposing heavy taxes to do so. Now comes a crop of well authenticated rumors that at the time of the recent crisis Britain had to surrender because of the insufficiency of her armament. There were, says the military expert, Captain Liddell Hart, less than 100 anti-aircraft guns in the London area, and many of them were unusable. Ammunition was lacking. The number of first-line aircraft was far inferior to Germany's. If these rumors are true, what was the Chamberlain government doing all these years? Certainly it did not start far behind Hitler. No wonder embarrassing questions are being asked in Westminster. It looks as if Chamberlain had let the country down, not only in the direction of the fears expressed by labor, but in the matter of his own promise to make the nation impregnable.

A Threat to California Unionism

At the November election, California voters will [illegible] "initiative proposal number [illegible]." If it is [illegible] chance—unionism in California will be greatly hampered. Ostensibly, it is designed merely to regulate picketing and a few other union activities. Actually, it is meant to bring about the open shop. Picketing would be permitted only in strikes over wages and hours, not over collective bargaining. Pickets would be strictly limited in number and actions, so limited that they might about as well not exist. Secondary picketing, or the boycotting of firms connected with one against which a strike had been called, would be prohibited. In the case of strikes over collective bargaining, there could be no picketing, no boycott, no interference with strikebreakers. It is doubtful whether union officials could even attempt to collect dues or solicit new members. This proposal originated with big-business interests hostile to unionism. They have admittedly spent nearly $100,000 to put it over, hiring a big advertising agency to sell the state the idea, just as the state was sold a pack of lies about Upton Sinclair a few years ago. California's middle class is said to be tired of the violence that has accompanied recent strikes and to assume that this violence is all labor's fault. Los Angeles recently adopted a drastic anti-picketing ordinance. If the new statewide measure passes, heaven help the unions.

The Labor Split Narrows

Pressure on American labor to close ranks, both from its own cohorts and from outside, was increased during the recent A. F of L. convention. John L. Lewis deflated William Green's belligerent attitude in attributing the split solely to him by offering to resign from the chairmanship of the CIO for the sake of peace, if Green would resign from the presidency of the A. F. of L. Frey and Woll, two of the principal opponents of the CIO in the older body, were indirectly rebuked by the rejection of a resolution they had drafted, which the convention construed as being opposed to the New Deal. A powerful influence was exerted by President Daniel Tobin of the Teamsters, not only the largest union in the Federation, but one of the most useful in strike strategy. Tobin's warning that his union may leave the Federation if the war continues may not convert the die-hards, but it shows them plainly enough that they cannot rely on this powerful army in a struggle to stop the CIO. Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins suggested a conciliation procedure to bring about peace.

There is no doubt that peace is essential and must come sooner or later. But just as we believe that the labor movement and the country have gained far more from the activities of the CIO than they would have gained if unity had been maintained at the beginning by servility to the dead hand of A. F. of L. officialdom, so now we should be sorry to see a peace that sacrificed any of the CIO's achievements in organizing the unor-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

News Notes of a Week

Colonel Lindbergh is now accused of being the man who wrecked the world. He is charged with having told important people in England that Germany was stronger in the air than England, France and Russia, and with having thereby frightened Chamberlain into virtually abandoning Europe to its fate. Against this theory two things are to be said: first, British espionage surely would have been a better guide to government action than the casual gossip of a civilian flyer, and second, Chamberlain for years has been playing Germany's game and opposing Soviet Russia. . . . At a trial of nine left-wing Communists for treason in Barcelona the prosecution charged that the POUM had "a non-aggression pact" with the Rebels on the Huesca front and caused two divisions to desert. . . . Relations between Germany and Brazil became strained again.

At home, much attention was given to the trial of four alleged German spies in New York City, one of whom has turned state's evidence. . . . Tom Mooney abandoned hope of any help from the United States Supreme Court and ordered his attorneys to withdraw all pending actions before that tribunal. . . . The Court agreed to review a case involving the deportation of an alien solely on the ground of membership in the Communist Party. . . . Secretary Wallace indicated his adherence to a policy of "dumping at home" for agricultural surpluses, in the form of government sale at a special low price for the use of those on relief and others in distress. . . . Political expediency triumphed over morality when Secretary of War Woodring appeared at a Hague rally in Jersey City.

Investigate the State Department

As soon as congress convenes, it should move at once to a new inquiry—an investigation more relevant and necessary than any it has conducted in recent years, with the possible exception of that by the La Follette Committee into violations of civil liberties. Indeed, if the authorization of the La Follette Committee would permit it to undertake this task with sufficient thoroughness, it should do so at once without waiting for Congress to assemble. We need a thorough study of the personnel and practices of the Department of State, including not only its staff in Washington, but its diplomatic and consular officials through the world.

The incident that occasions this suggestion is bad enough in itself, but it is far more important as an index finger pointing to the kind of men who are day by day conducting the foreign relations of the greatest democracy in the world during a period when democracy is facing danger. We refer to the John Strachey affair.

In this "free" country, dedicated to civil liberties, we great democracy, also noted as a haven of liberal principles, had been debarred from entering. Why? Did he intend to make his home here and was he outside the quota? No, he was merely coming for a visit. Did he have a contagious disease? Was he a convicted criminal? Was there reason to expect him to kill, rob or defraud? Was he without visible means of support? Was he suspected of smuggling or of dealing in forbidden drugs or in prostitution? Was he a spy, or the leader of an invading army? Did we expect him to organize one? No, he is not in any sense an outlaw or a character dangerous to society. On the contrary, he is a distinguished writer, of a well known family, who had come over openly to give lectures to such audiences as would pay to come and hear him. He is, moreover, a good speaker and is worth paying to hear. What had happened was that somebody had denied us the right to hear him. Who took this presumptuous course, and for what reason?

John Strachey had a passport from his own government, and a visa permitting him to visit the United States, issued by a consular officer of this country. Consular officers are subordinate to the Department of State. While Mr. Strachey was on the Atlantic, the visa was canceled by the issuing authority. That led to his automatic exclusion by the immigration officials, who are subordinate to the Department of Labor. But it was not the Department of Labor which acted, and the real decision to deny him admittance was not taken under the authority of the officials whose duty it is to administer the immigration laws. He was denied permission to enter by an official of the State Department, residing in England.

In reply to a request for information as to the reason for this curious and arbitrary procedure, official sources replied that when Mr. Strachey applied for his visa he was asked if he were a Communist and denied it, but that later the issuing authority was informed that he was a member of the British Communist Party and a member of its Central Executive Committee. Upon hearing this, Mr. Strachey again denied that he was a Communist, saying that he was a Socialist. He also denied that he was a member of the governing body of the Communist Party. The Department of State has not revealed the identity of his accuser. There is no legal way to appeal from the decision of the Consul, and no chance to establish the facts by evidence in open court. There the matter rests, or at least it rests there for the moment.

Those conservative defenders of liberty in this country who are always on the alert for interference with due process and the Bill of Rights by arbitrary administrative bureaus have here an extreme case to complain about. Is it purely administrative caprice, exercised by individual consular officials, as to who shall be denied visas? Aside from all questions of procedure, is there

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tance into this country to all Communists—even supposing the charge in this case to be true? Must we be protected from hearing things said by an Englishman which would be completely within the law if said by an American citizen, and also completely within the law if said by a British subject in England? Of course it would be absurd to suppose in a case like this that the speaker would incite to force and violence, or that there would be any imminent danger of such incitement being followed. And that is the basic legal test establishing the boundaries of free speech on political subjects in both nations.

There are much more credible explanations for the curious action of our diplomatic machinery in this case than that it was a conscientious but tortured and mistaken construction of the law. One is that the American Legion or some other body of self-appointed superpatriots brought political pressure to bear in Washington. Another is that the action resulted from Roman Catholic intrigue and pressure. A third—and the version most current among informed persons—is that Mr. Strachey was about to criticize the Chamberlain government and the Munich peace, and that it was an obsequious desire to do a favor to London officials that led the State Department to act.

Such explanations are credible because of the former behavior of the Department and of some of our diplomats. Everyone who knows anything of the inside of Washington knows that while there are numerous excellent and able "career man" in the service, it is also honeycombed with others who have little sympathy with democratic forces either in America or elsewhere, men who frequently act as pawns for the Catholic hierarchy or the British Tories or other near-Fascist elements. Such influence in the State Department it was that almost single-handed induced President Roosevelt and Congress to clap on the Spanish embargo and prevented it from being lifted in the face of a strong demand, even from the authors of the neutrality legislation. It seeps in and compromises our policy in numerous unpublicized respects. But such is the atmosphere of "hush-hush" about the conduct of foreign relations that the country does not know—except when an untoward revelation like the Strachey incident takes place—what a misrepresentative group is often in charge of our foreign relations.

It may be argued—in fact it has been argued by such a prominent journalist as Walter Lippmann—that since Communists as well as Fascists are enemies of democratic institutions, we should deny them both the civil liberties that we permit to adherents of the democratic system. The technique of aspiring dictatorship, according to this theory, is first to use the rights of democracy to persuade the people to entrust the dictatorship with power, and then to destroy democracy with the power gained. We know of no case in which a dictator, con-

arts of persuasion, has been installed by popular vote before he seized or was given the reins of government. This was not the course taken by Lenin, Mussolini or Hitler. But in any case a democracy that is not sturdy enough to hear and dispose of the arguments of its opponents is certain to fall a prey to them in some other way. Nothing is surer than that if free speech is denied to those assumed to be enemies of democracy, it will soon be denied also to its friends. The place to draw the line is in the denial not of the right to speak, but of the subsidizing, uniforming, drilling or arming of pressure groups and private armies, of the efforts to supersede or corrupt the polls.

When someone begins to tell us that any doctrine is too dangerous for us to hear, the hurricane warning is up. We may be sure that he thinks of the citizens, not as the rulers of the state, but as a mob to be cajoled. And when this someone is an official making his decisions without clear authorization of law, it is time for democracy to act to protect itself, not against the excluded speaker, but against the official.

At any time it would be desirable to prevent an ingrown clique of diplomatic experts from swaying our foreign policy in directions contrary to the genius of our institutions. Just now it is of supreme importance to make sure that we are not being led by the nose in an anti-democratic direction. The recent triumphs of Hitler and Mussolini, threatening to spread illiberal dictatorship over a large portion of the globe, have roused a demand for larger armaments. There may be wisdom in that, but nothing could be plainer than that these victories have been won, not so much by virtue of military superiority on the part of the victors as by the connivance of sympathetic forces in high places in the nations that have surrendered. There are many fascists and near-fascists among the ruling classes of the "democracies" themselves. One of the first signs by which you may know them, and one of the surest, is that they play upon an exaggerated fear of communism in order to justify an illiberal and anti-democratic course both at home and abroad. Let us put on the record what the Department of State is really up to, and who really determines its policies.

Wage Cuts for Looted Railroads

THE TESTIMONY before the President's Emergency Board on the railroads' proposal to cut the annual wage of their 900,000 employees a quarter of a billion dollars a year came to a dramatic close on October 15. This advisory board, made up of three experienced public men, Chief Justice Walter P. Stacy of North Carolina, Dean James M. Landis of the Harvard Law School and Professor Harry A. Millis of the University of Chicago, must report to the President by Octo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After receiving much testimony about the dire need of the carriers, the board heard Senator Wheeler, chairman of the Senate committee that has conducted a three-year investigation of the railroads. He presented the figures showing an unbroken sharp upturn in railroad traffic and revenue in recent months, achieved without any wage cut. He said there is danger that railroad wage cuts will start wage reductions in other industries, and at any rate cause other workers to spend less because of fear of attempts to cut their own salary scales, of possible strikes and of unemployment during strike. The Senator warned that the resulting large decrease in purchasing power might retard the present general recovery, and that wage cutting by the railroads at this juncture is in the nature of a dangerous experiment.

Senator Wheeler presented figures about which the railroad executives have been silent. In the depressed eight-year period, 1930-37, the gross revenues of the roads aggregated $30,000,000,000, and they earned for their owners $5,750,000,000. Even in 1938, the year of crisis, as the railroad association called it in a million-dollar publicity campaign, the industry as a whole earned a profit every month except February. Wheeler recognized, as all do, that the railroads have serious problems, but he said that the question before the board is not whether a wage cut is needed to enable the roads to run. The question is whether the profit of the owners should be increased out of the pockets of their employees. He said this would be dangerous to the general welfare, and unfair to the workers, because railroad managements should first eliminate indefensible wastes which cost the roads far more than they are now asking the men to sacrifice. He described twenty-one categories of financial squandering of railroad funds in recent years. He estimated that if the managements were free to deprive their overlords and concerns with which they have interlocking connections of their "gravy," and would bring other wastes to an end, the roads could save a million dollars a day.

John J. Pelley, the chief representative of the railroad managements, head of the Association of American Railroads, took the stand the next day, the last for giving evidence in the board proceedings. He denied that there were such wastes. Cross-examined, he admitted he did not know about the specific cases of waste, mismanagement and fraud exposed by the Wheeler committee in its three years of public hearings. He had an agent at the hearings, they were held in public at the Capitol—a twenty-five-cent taxi-ride from Pelley's office—his large staff could have summarized the testimony for him. But he just wasn't interested. Pressed to answer, he finally said: all these wastes are "little things." He was asked if the virtual stealing of millions from railroad treasuries is a little thing. He was asked about the New Haven Railroad, of which he had been president. Asked if its present bankruptcy could have been avoided if the company's directors had not earlier used its funds for a stock-buying orgy. He was asked if losses of hundreds of millions of dollars by railroads in the stock market were "little things." Pinned in a corner, this head of all the railroad managements of the country blurted out, "What is wrong with it?" The New York Times on the same day reported that even in Wall Street there is support for the "forward step" of preventing "costly stock-buying programs such as have helped weak roads to bankruptcy and injured the credit of strong companies in recent years." But the chief of the railroad managers, defending a practice that had helped Wall Street interests and wrecked railroads, including his own, seemingly did not know that even the financial community was beginning to doubt what he still deemed it necessary for managements to justify.

Pelley admitted that on steel rails, for which the roads spend huge sums, they seek competitive bids, and get the same price quotations from all the companies. He admitted that the chief railroad bankers are the chief steel-company bankers. Mention of these gentlemen made an immediate apologist of him. Maybe, he said, the steel companies quote the selfsame price because their costs of manufacture are the same. Earlier, he appeared so anxious to protect J. P. Morgan and Company that he professed not to know, when asked, who were the bankers for his own road, the New Haven.

As Senator Wheeler has said, the heads of our railroads are estimable and in numerous instances able men, who are not their own masters. Until they are made free to clean house, until the squandering of railroad funds stops, they should not be permitted to pass the tin cup to shippers and consumers for hundreds of millions of dollars of increased freight charges, and to labor for $250,000,000 in wage cuts.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors

H. N. BRAILSFORD HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD R. G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD, *Advertising Manager* BYRON DEXTER, *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe: Four Views

Why England Capitulated

FEELING IN ENGLAND during the crisis, as your correspondent observed it, swung rapidly from one extreme to the other. When Mr. Chamberlain flew back from Berchtesgaden and ordered the Czechs to submit to dismemberment, the revolt of public opinion was general and pronounced. The usual Anglo-Saxon reserve vanished, and strangers confided to one another that they were ashamed of being Englishmen. A Tory neighbor of mine, a retired soldier who had never before spoken to me, burst into a torrent of indignation, and declared that the Prime Minister was himself "just another dictator." A workman busy on a ladder shouted as his greeting the slogan, "The b—— must be stopped." And for several days every organized group, from party caucus to village chapel, ran about in search of ways of "stopping the b——." Had this nation possessed even one courageous and magnetic political leader, it could have been swept during these tense days of anger into an attitude of resolute resistance to the aggressor. Unfortunately it felt much and thought little. It felt concern and respect for the Czechs, who do not divide its sympathies as the Spaniards do. It felt shame that it should desert people to whom it owed protection. But it had no grasp of the strategical problem, and did not realize that in one short week the whole balance of power in Europe was irreparably shifted to the prejudice of freedom.

When in the last days preparations for war suddenly began, other and contrary emotions captured its mind. Under its eyes the grass of the London parks was dug up to make air-raid shelters. Londoners would stand for five hours in a terrified line, waiting for their gas masks. Villagers, to my knowledge, were awakened after midnight to receive these dubious pledges of safety. Urban schoolchildren, all over the island, were transported to the remotest hamlets. As this went on, the *voces populi* changed their tune. Now it was the mothers among my neighbors who stopped me in the street, or called me on the telephone, in terror at the fate that awaited their sons. There are suspicious minds who believe that Mr. Chamberlain, never himself intending to go to war in any conceivable circumstances, staged these precautionary steps in order to deflate the brave anger he had aroused. I do not myself read this far from subtle man in this way, but in fact his measures had this effect. The result was that when he flew home from the Munich conference, the masses accepted imperial instincts would have prompted it to check.

So overwhelming was this sense of release after tension that the Labor Party, when it met on Monday at Westminster, was so divided as to the tactics it should pursue that it could come to no decision, and took its place in the House without a motion to hand in to the clerk at the table. But the average citizen is neither happy nor confident about the future. I doubt whether one man in ten shares Mr. Chamberlain's belief that he has won "peace for our time." Already the painful process of reflection has begun. A month or two hence, if the threatened general election should be held, the landslide, on which the Tories reckon, may not occur.

The defeated democracies were undone because they tried to reason and did it badly. Conscience made cowards of them. First, even when they steeled themselves to the necessity for resistance, the voice of experience warned them that a war undertaken to rescue freedom might end in another orgy of imperialism with a second Versailles Treaty. Few were sure that the values they might save would outweigh the values they must lose. Fewer still had the fanatical faith that might have wrested for the Left, from the Chamberlains and Daladiers, the direction of the struggle.

Second, the taint of Versailles lay over this quarrel. Hitler chose his pretext well. Each of us asked himself: Must I fight to hold down three million subjects of the Czech Republic against their will? It required some familiarity with the processes of history and some power of divining the future to make the adequate answer.

But the historian will have to answer otherwise the narrower question about the conduct of the two governments. Neither Premier is a man of big caliber, and both were surrounded by comfortable, rich men who dread "bolshevism" (as they call it) more than they fear fascism. This inner governing class does not yet wish to abandon democracy at home, because it is justly confident in its own practised ability to manage the people for its own ends. But it decidedly prefers fascism, at the safe distance of Rome and Berlin, if the alternative is the ascendancy of the Left in any form. For two reasons, therefore, it will always refuse to make war on Germany or Italy, unless these powers deprive it of any choice. It knows that to achieve victory over these two combined it must call in the aid of Russia, to its mind the arch-enemy. It realizes that if it were to defeat their dictators, their fall would be followed by something approaching a social revolution. These two considerations account for its monotonous retreats before the "Have-Not" powers, whom all its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adroit use of technical arguments. It had almost totally neglected the defense of England from aerial attack, for the very good reason that (as its naval agreement suggested) it never really contemplated the possibility of an Anglo-German war. If it piled up arms at great cost, it viewed them only as bargaining counters. When the test came, it pointed with great effect to the defenseless condition of its island. Its second argument, conveyed like the first chiefly by a whispering campaign, turned on the alleged weakness of the Red Army. The well informed ran around with great industry quoting secret statements (one supposedly from Colonel Lindbergh) that reduced Russia's air power to a minus quantity. The better informed had a different estimate, but they are not numerous. That is the price freedom has paid for Stalin's purge.

The hearts of English progressives fail them when they try to forecast the future. The Opposition, alike in England and in France, is too divided and too weak to upset this governing caste that led two once great nations to the capitulation of Munich. Russia will retire to her steppes. The Western powers, with France a cipher, will make their terms with the two dictators, and they will go on paying what these demand—loans, colonies, and worst of all, the freedom of Spain. When at last the exactions of the victors become intolerable, the democracies will awaken to the discovery that they face their destiny alone, their strategical bastions abandoned and all their allies bound in chains.

London H. N. BRAILSFORD

Why France Sold the Pass

FRANCE must bear the major responsibility for the betrayal of Czechoslovakia. Granted that Chamberlain, from the beginning, worked for this end. Granted that a large part of Britain's ruling class supported him. Yet France cannot blame England. Every responsible French observer agrees that England never once suggested that it would fail to back France in case of war. No French reactionary changed from an anti-Czech to a pro-Czech attitude so sensationally as did the arch-Tory editor J. L. Garvin, after Godesberg. Crossing from England to France in the midst of the crisis, I was at once struck by the weakness of the French press, compared to the English, on making a stand against Hitler. No, French weakness was the principal factor in bringing about Hitler's triumph.

Foreign Minister Bonnet starred as villain in this miserable tragedy. He consistently opposed a firm stand against Hitler, objected to mobilization and cast doubt on Russia's real willingness to honor her obligations. He made the British government skeptical of French military preparedness for a war. For instance, he is said to have [illegible] viewed the air-force weakness and other shortcomings, while suppressing another part which emphasized the real superiority of the French army to the German. Finally, he put pressure on the Czechs, wholly without authorization from the Cabinet, to accept the Anglo-French terms after Berchtesgaden. And all to accomplish a political intrigue in conjunction with Flandin which would reward him with the premiership.

Premier Daladier shares Bonnet's guilt, although he had no such shameful motive. He simply ran true to form. A mediocre Radical *politico*, his previous record provides the explanation. He displayed his inherent indecision of character during the riots of February, 1934, when he was Premier. Discredited thereby, he sought to regain power by jumping on the Popular Front bandwagon and by soft-pedaling his traditional policy of Franco-German *rapprochement*. All this came to the fore at the moment when the Czech crisis reached a climax. On the fateful September 13, he found his Cabinet split on the subject of mobilization and could only resolve the difficulty by appealing to the all-too-willing Chamberlain to make peace with Germany whatever the cost.

But it is well to state that he led a nation as undecided as himself. From Right to Left, from top to bottom, France wobbled. The Right developed sharp divisions. Two big business papers—Journée Industrielle and Petit Bleu—wanted a firm stand. They were countered by the Comité des Forges organ, Le Temps, and other business mouthpieces. Nationalist and "strong-stand" reactionaries like Kerillis, Buré and Pertinax were opposed by the defeatist Bailby (Jour), Lausanne (Matin) and Fabry (Intransigeant). Others like Colonel de la Rocque straddled all over their newsprint with a completely unintelligible policy. Bribery doubtless played its part in this disarray of the press. Some of the most confused papers, it is said, actually reflected a struggle between money from across the Rhine and subsidies from the government's secret funds.

Like a truly Radical organ, the Front Populaire L'Oeuvre funked when a crisis appeared (apparently confirming the reports that it has been sold to a Fascist group). It ran reams of anti-war articles alongside the strongly anti-Fascist columns of Geneviève Tabouis. Today it features a subscription fund to give a present to Mrs. Chamberlain! The Socialists, too, broke ranks. The fundamentally pacifist tradition of this party undermined its hitherto strong resolution to make a stand. Léon Blum, one of his friends tells me, backed down for two reasons: (1) being a Jew, he feared that the rising anti-Semitism would discharge itself on him and his party should he take a bellicose line; and (2) his innate pacifism came to the surface under stress. Thus the Left vacillated at the eleventh

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nor the Front Populaire spirit which it invokes commands its former following. The conversion of the Spanish question into a political football, the successive defeats of Blum and the concessions which Popular Front governments have made to reaction had undermined the Popular Front movement. No one who saw the Popular Front parade on last July 14 could have failed to notice the sparse line of spectators and the lackluster spirit of the marchers. The *mystique* of Front Populaire has gone perhaps forever.

The mobilization, instead of reviving nationalist brio among the people, had an almost reverse effect. A partial call to the colors of only certain categories of reservists included many middle-aged men. The first *mobilisé* I met was forty-nine years old, with a son who had not been called. A news vendor said to me, "Bad for business this mobilization—since war hasn't started, it makes no sense." I watched these reservists glumly entrain, at the Gare de l'Est. Relatives tearfully or sullenly bade them goodbye. Pacifists on the one hand, Popular Front last-ditchers on the other, tried to start demonstrations among the crowd. Neither got any response. The reservists took their call to duty with obedience, but with conspicuous lack of enthusiasm.

Yet this spirit might have been different had there been a strong government led by a decisive personality. The reservists once in uniform quickly acquired a good *ésprit de corps*. Journalists returning from the Maginot Line declare that the soldiers were ready to fight and confident of victory. Only a real directing hand was lacking. Such a hand might have ironed out dissent. It would surely have played the poker which was obviously the only element necessary to cause a German backdown. But, this absent, all the rest, from the conflicting eddies of popular opinion to the inability to bluff at diplomacy, followed inevitably.

On the sad morrow, disquieting results are now appearing. Back of the relief at demobilization and peace, one can discern among the workers not only a disgust with their clumsy government, but also a disillusion with such slogans as "democracy," "front against fascism," etc. For its part, the reactionary press has already suggested a rather ominous line: "An Economic, Social and Political Maginot Line Must Be Built." "Order," "Work," "Production" (meaning suppression of strikes, longer hours and lower wages) litter the leading articles of the corrupt press. Kerillis, recently the darling of the Leftists, now demands an "authoritarian republic" to protect the country from Germany and I have heard at least two liberals agree. Observers predict that the CGT will soon face the fight of its life and that a period of industrial disorder looms. While France will undoubtedly encounter more trouble from abroad, trouble at home may prove more

After Munich—What?

THE SUDDEN TURN OF EVENTS during September that led up to Hitler's decisive victory at Munich probably surprised no one more than the Führer. There are reasons for believing that even during the first week of that month he did not expect to annex the Sudeten districts this year. He was still demanding the formation of a Nazi state within Czechoslovakia. On September 3, I had a talk with Dr. Hermann Santheim, at Hybernska 4, in Prague. As spokesman for Konrad Henlein, Dr. Santheim kept reiterating that the Sudeten-Deutsch Party was not demanding Anschluss with Germany. "We ask only that the Karlsbad program be carried out," he assured me. "We want autonomy for our German people within the Czechoslovak state." Nine days later at Nuremberg Hitler made a thinly veiled threat to annex the Sudeten area unless the Czechs stopped their "shameless treatment" of the Teutonic minority. Rioting in Sudetenland immediately followed his oration. Henlein fled across the border and demanded union of Sudetenland with the Reich.

Inasmuch as the SDP automatically carried out Hitler's orders, his policies were their policies. When Santheim spoke for Henlein and said that the SDP did not ask for union with Germany, it seems reasonable to believe that his words reflected Hitler's policies. What, then, happened to change Hitler's plans from autonomy to annexation in little more than a week? Did the contents of the forthcoming Runciman report leak out? Did the Nazis learn that the English mediator would recommend separation of the Sudeten districts from the rest of Czechoslovakia?

Now that Hitler has annexed Sudetenland, what will he do next? Six months hence the German press may be directing violent tirades against Lithuania, Denmark, Switzerland, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia or even Poland. The Führer may be denouncing the "massacre" of Germans in Memel, or Danish "terrorism" in South Jutland. He may be calling for the right of "self-determination" by the eight hundred thousand Teutonic minority in Rumania. Or he may appoint some Swiss Henlein to stir up trouble within the Germanic cantons of the mountain republic. The Teutonic minority islands scattered from the Gulf of Finland to the Danube-Sava line provide the Nazis with a wide field for future streamlined aggression.

Last year Dr. Tibor Eckhardt, perhaps the outstanding Hungarian statesman, told Premier Hodza of Czechoslovakia that unless a Danubian confederation could be formed at once all the small nations in that area would fall before Hitler. "Austria will be first," said Eckhardt, "your Czechoslovakia will be second and my Hungary will be third." On the first two counts Dr. Eckhardt has been proved right. It may

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That Hitler will soon march into Hungary seems unlikely. It appears far more probable that he will encourage the indigenous Hungarian Nazi movement to obtain control of the country. A Nazi puppet government in Budapest would suit Hitler perfectly. Such a regime would make it possible for the Germans to obtain Hungarian grain and cattle on their own terms. If the need arose, Hitler could send a German army across Hungary into Rumania to ensure the constant flow of Rumanian oil to the Reich. Hungary would, indeed, become a base of German operations for the drives toward the Ukraine and the Golden Horn.

As for Rumania, that colorful kingdom is in a state of jitters. There is, of course, the nightmare of a Russo-German war fought on Rumanian soil; there is the increasing probability that Rumania will soon have to choose between the Soviet and the Reich, a perilous choice; and there is always the prospect that the Reich may back the revisionist claims of Bulgaria and Hungary against Rumania. Bucharest dreads the possibility that the Bulgars, with their small but efficient army, may, with Nazi backing, demand return of the southern Dobrudja. Or that Hungary, with Hitler's blessing, may demand the return of Transylvania. In the background, moreover, always looms the apparition of conflict with the USSR over Bessarabia.

King Carol, perennially the realist untroubled by sentiment, knows that he cannot long escape a decision about his relations with Hitler. Now more than ever, his pro-Nazi advisers can warn him that France is a long way off, that Germany is coming nearer. Reports of renewed Iron Guard activity in Rumania may be significant. In the heyday of the League, Rumania could rest secure in her network of pacts and alliances. But today all that is changed. The fate of Czechoslovakia has been a warning to Carol to come to terms with Hitler while there is still time to drive a bargain.

Even the tough Yugoslavs have no desire to be isolated and attacked by a coalition of Fascist states. Just now, it is true, nearly all of Yugoslavia's neighbors are bidding for her support. But so realistic a Premier as Stoyadinovitch knows that this situation could change overnight, that once more his neighbors might attempt to split up the triune kingdom. The Ethiopian crisis made the South Slavs skeptical about the good faith of the Western democracies. The Munich settlement has destroyed any lingering hope in Yugoslav minds that France and Britain would take a determined stand against Hitler. Belgrade feels, therefore, that it must reach an understanding with Berlin.

While Poland celebrates the acquisition of Teschen from Czechoslovakia, Colonel Beck and his followers can point to the Munich conference as a vindication of their coolness toward the Franco-Polish alliance. If the French would not support Czechoslovakia, say the

of uneasiness in every informed Pole's mind. The German thrust into Czechoslovakia increases the German encirclement of Poland. Berlin's and Warsaw's policies already conflict in what is left of Czechoslovakia, especially in Ruthenia. Not only is Poland now more isolated than ever, but the four-power conference in itself gives cause for concern. The Poles have strongly opposed the four-power idea ever since it was broached by Mussolini five years ago. For they realize that sooner or later they are bound to come into conflict with the expanding Reich. Suppose that on some future occasion another four-power conference is hastily summoned by the Führer to render a decision about the Polish Corridor. And suppose that the conferees decide that in the interest of "peace" Poland must hand over the Corridor to Germany on two days' notice.

Now we come to Hitler's relations with the Soviet Union. Failing to obtain some kind of agreement with Russia, Hitler appears likely to carry out an attempt to wrest the Ukraine from the Soviet. His method would probably follow the line pursued in Czechoslovakia—that is, to work from within. If German diplomatic efforts in Moscow fail to win the USSR as a partner for the Nazi empire, then we may expect to hear a demand originating in Berlin that the Ukrainian people be granted the right of "self-determination." That would be a signal that the Nazis are beginning their onslaught upon the USSR.

It is logical to expect a lull for some months in Europe. Hitler needs time to consolidate his gains. But we cannot be sure of any long breathing spell. Less than seven months after the Führer entered Austria, he was riding triumphantly through Sudetenland. One of a dictator's handicaps is that he must keep on bringing home victories. A "dynamic peace policy" allows for no long breathing spells. HENRY C. WOLFE

The Great Conspiracy

LAST APRIL I wrote that the program of Britain's Tories required "the peaceful yielding of Central and Eastern Europe to Hitler—gracefully, through a four-power-pact or, if need be, disgracefully through surrender. It further requires the reduction of France to the status of a third-rate power. . . . Chamberlain has told Hitler to take Czechoslovakia, without war if possible." This program, never acknowledged but plain for all eyes to see, is now well on the way toward complete realization. The late "crisis" must be evaluated in the light of it.

In reality, *there was no war crisis at any time,* save that Britain's Prime Minister had a bad morning on September 29 when he feared (needlessly) that his partner in crime might let him down. Instead of a war

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agreement. The hoax was necessary because British and French opinion could not be induced to accept the Chamberlain-Hitler program unless it was first brought by thunder and threats to the apparent brink of war, then convinced that war would be both unnecessary and suicidal, and finally snatched back in trembling fear to safety and "peace" by noble and heroic gestures. The Prime Minister supplied the gestures. Der Führer supplied the threats and thunder. Il Duce was party to the bargain. Benes was betrayed, Daladier hoodwinked, Litvinov ignored, Roosevelt and Hull deceived and adroitly used to serve Chamberlain's purpose. All the important steps were prearranged. The drama was played out according to plan.

The outcome was an unqualified triumph for Hitler and Chamberlain, though few knew the purport of the plot and these few were silent. The outcome was not only a complete vindication of Hitler's political technique but a demonstration that Neville Chamberlain is the most astute politician and the most sincere and sinful hypocrite of the decade, if not of all the ages. His task was the more difficult one. He was obliged to carry the arts of dissimulation to a point quite unknown in the totalitarian states, where explanations do not need to be convincing. Despite his few hours of anxiety at the end, when he feared that Hitler might spoil the game, his success was brilliant beyond his dreams. The outcome was also the complete destruction of the world balance of power. They planned it that way. The further outcome will be the Demise of the West. This was unplanned but is none the less inevitable.

Chamberlain's plan can readily be reconstructed, at least in outline. Primary object: Fascist hegemony over the Continent through the isolation of France as a means of safeguarding the Empire and the privileges of the British ruling classes by turning the Fascist coalition against Moscow. Secondary object: the smashing of the People's Front in France, Spain and elsewhere, the *reductio ad absurdum* of the policies of the Comintern and Narkomindel, and the annihilation of collective security at Geneva. Direct means: the destruction of Czechoslovakia to give Hitler a free road to the Balkans and the Ukraine. Indirect means: severance of the Paris-Prague, Prague-Moscow and Paris-Moscow alliances, the disintegration of the French bloc, the degradation of France to the position of a "neutralized" British dependency and the isolation of the USSR. Primary obstacle: the disposition of Prague and Moscow and perhaps Paris to fight for life by opposing Nazi hegemony over Europe. Secondary obstacle: emotional attachment of British (and French) public to democracy, justice, the rule of law, loyalty to obligations and other inconvenient abstractions. Means of circumvention: stronger emotional attachment to

embellished by defensive posturing at London and Paris, coupled with "desperate" air flights to the Reich and all the bogus paraphernalia of military preparations, gas defense, ultimata and frenzied "last-minute" efforts to avert "hostilities." Result (if successful): glory of preserving "peace," public acquiescence in the betrayal of Czechoslovakia, Fascist hegemony over the Continent, French impotence, Soviet isolation, Czech liquidation, and (in hopeful prospect) security for the Empire, the plutocracy and the aristocracy through the destruction of democracy in Europe and a future war-to-the-death between fascism and communism.

If it be objected that this formulation confuses anterior purposes with unforeseen consequences, the answer is in the record. Every step taken at London since March, every step predicted in April, was perfectly calculated to produce the results now achieved. Only the naïve will suppose that this was happenstance or muddling or stupidity or funk. Chamberlain and his clique planned all, anticipated all, calculated all, including the post-mortem criticisms and the need of pronouncing them "preposterous." They could not have expected to gain all their goals at one blow nor could they have hoped that all the witless ones to whom they had assigned roles would heed their cues and recite their lines to perfection. That this came to pass was attributable partly to genius, partly to luck and partly to the mental and moral degeneration of classes and masses alike in Western Europe. Chamberlain and Company played the game well and won. The Devil deserves his due.

The future? China, Spain and all Mittel-Europa are destined to pass into Fascist hands. The French colonial empire, ultimately French democracy and perhaps even the survival of France as a power are beyond saving. This is all in the reckoning, since the reckoners, while knaves, are not fools. But beyond this? The Fascist Triplice may fulfill Tory dreams and attack the USSR. Or it *may* choose to follow the paths of least resistance and deviate from "Mein Kampf." Those paths lead not toward Moscow and Irkutsk but toward Byzantium, Bagdad, India and Egypt; toward Hong Kong, Indo-China and the East Indies; toward North and Central Africa; and possibly in the end toward Mother England. In this event London will call for aid. There will be deafening silence in Moscow and, it is to be hoped, in Washington. Dr. Chamberlain's chickens may yet come home to roost.

Thoughts of solace: there will now be no "world war." The Third Reich has won. If it moves against Moscow, the West will be neutral. If it moves against the West, Moscow will be neutral. Neutrality forever!

T. S. Eliot wrote thirteen years ago: "This is the way the world ends; this is the way the world ends;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Barton, Barton, Barton and Barton

ADVERTISING MEN claim they help to civilize America. Advertising enemies say the business is 90-percent economic waste, 33-percent fraud. Advertising stunts have amused, amazed, alarmed the nation, and the present campaign by one of our leading advertising aces, who is said to use Congress as a halfway house to the presidency, is also open to alliterative astonishment.

Pick up any metropolitan newspaper—and hundreds throughout the country. Almost every day there is a story about a man named Barton. Barton says, Barton suggests, Barton shakes hands, Barton laughs, Barton sneezes. It's Barton, Barton, Barton everywhere. College-journalism boys write their themes after measuring this publicity to prove scientifically just how many columns of headlines, features, pictures, have been devoted to this advertiser turned politician, how few to his rivals, but every reporter in town knows that the New York City press has worn out its knees kowtowing to the man who controls fifty, perhaps a hundred, million dollars' worth of paid ads.

For two years Bruce Barton has gotten a big play, whereas—as can be proved by a yardstick—his opponents have had almost nothing. It is of course true that Barton knows how to get publicity. But here is the proof that the newspapers of the metropolis have always played the game in favor of the representative of big business. It is proof in the antipodal manner: today the newspapers overplay Barton; in 1933 they suppressed the news to protect Barton.

It is the present writer's opinion that freedom of the press does not entitle newspapers to publish personal scandal, and that a law to that effect might perhaps be a good thing. Therefore none of the details of the case of Barton v. King, in General Sessions, before Judge Corrigan, in July and August, 1933, will be given here, except the fact that Bruce Barton accused Mrs. Florence W. King of blackmail and attempted extortion and that the testimony showed (as he also admitted) that Barton had previously settled for $25,000 an alienation-of-affection suit brought by Mr. King. These meager facts are mentioned to prove that the story was of stellar tabloidal magnitude, the page-one stuff on which our yellow journalism feeds.

Nevertheless, only the ultra-respectable newspapers covered the story. The New York Times, from July 19 to August 3, carried ten items, one on page 2, the rest on pages 20 to 40. The reporting was dignified, adequate and complete for a conservative newspaper.

The New York Sun covered the story, but in less space, despite the fact that it "broke" for the evening [illegible]tember 12, got a much smaller head and [illegible]

But obviously because Barton controlled big advertising money, the other seven newspapers of the metropolis handled the story in this way:

The World-Telegram: Nothing on August 20; six-inch story on August 21, barely telling facts. Then silence. Obviously suppressed after first story. Numerous similar divorce, alienation suits by non-advertisers played up.

The Daily News: On August 19, 21 and 22, story played down to five to eight inches, pages 24 to 40; 28, a slider head on a one-and-one-half-inch story; on the 29 another six-inch story. Tabloid stuff played way down. Other people's scandals played way up.

The New York American: The inventor of yellow journalism was still booming other scandals; many columns on Mdivani princes; three-column picture of Mrs. Hearst and Balbo; but not a line on Barton.

The New York Journal: Likewise suppressed.

The Daily Mirror: Likewise suppressed, although this is the leading Hearst tabloid.

The New York Evening Post: Suppressed.

The New York Herald Tribune: Suppressed main story first five days; published small item on August 25; another on August 28, both expurgated.

The fact that The Times and The Sun, conservative papers, published the Barton story makes its nature impossible as a defense by other "respectable" sheets. And in view of the fact that most papers which suppressed the item devoted daily columns and full-page Sundays to an almost identical story involving a non-advertising banker, defense by these papers is ridiculous. We find that five papers suppressed the case entirely, two buried it, only one out of nine gave it the space its news value rated under the present ethical code. The writer has spent days in the New York Public Library confirming the above facts, which again prove how false is the current claim that news is no longer mishandled in favor of advertisers.

But when it comes to the reverse, overindulgence rather than suppression of Bartoniana, no search is needed. Consider the recent Times:

May 1: Faith in the Nation Is Urged by Barton
May 27: Moratorium on Talk Proposed by Barton
June 5: Barton asks Study of "7 Deadly Sores"
June 25: Barton Sees Crisis for Middle Class

And so on, through the summer.

On September 1, Barton got two headlines: "Barton and Fish Backed by A. F. of L." and "Barton Appeals to Industrialists." On September 7, two stories, one expressing the hope Fay would be defeated, another doubting a third term for Roosevelt. Fay's reply, Sep-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

September 13, whereas a head twice as big that day announced "Wagner Act Partial, Barton Tells Women."

Even when Barton started a furious publicity crusade to rearrange the Presidents on our postage stamps —having spotted a sinister Democratic plot to put Republican demigods on higher-priced stickers which the humble masses never see—The Times joined the less dignified press in giving Barton notable space. But if its generous treatment is not evidence of bias, what is one to say to a Times news story which reads: "Mr. Barton, a business man doing a turn of civic duty in Congress. . . ." This wording is purely editorial. The Times cannot mean to say every business man who gets himself elected to Congress performs a civic duty. The only possible meaning is an editorial endorsement of this man, which in a news item constitutes a flagrant abuse of the ethical code.

On the other hand neither Walter Liebman nor George Backer, the Democrat and Labor Party candidates, can get any space worth mentioning in the metropolitan press, not even in the four New Deal papers. This is one of the rare instances in national history where the press fails to support its own party man. Against this is the fact that The (Republican) New York Herald Tribune, which naturally supports its party candidate, has been honest enough to give the opposition small but absolutely fair treatment. In fact a measurement of items in the Liebman clipping book proves The Herald Tribune fairer to him than several self-proclaimed New Deal papers.

The Times has given about four times as much space to Liebman's opponent as to him. Granting that Barton is a publicity man, a maker of news and all that, there is still the negative evidence that The Times is not helping Liebman, whereas it is keeping Barton brightly before the Democratic public.

The Post, most passionate of administration papers, did come out editorially for Liebman on the Labor ticket, but since then has supported neither Liebman nor Backer. It too gives Barton beautiful feature heads on Republican news items, such as "Bruce Barton Likens Dewey to Alexander Hamilton," on October 6.

The News has given Liebman space and several photographs. Its coverage appears fair, even if there is no indication whatever of the usual support which a 100-percent New Dealer expects. On the other hand, The News has also published such editorials as the following (August 30):

> Talking about the Republicans, everyone wonders whom they'll nominate for President in 1940. Our idea is that they ought to—
>
> NOMINATE BRUCE BARTON
>
> —as the Republican candidate. We don't see why he wouldn't be the logical candidate. He is an able business man, he knows what makes Big Business tick. . . . This . . . but he speaks for the conserva-

The World-Telegram, which recently resented being read out of the New Deal by The News, has given Barton more space (by actual count) than any New York paper, including the Republican organs. It has also supported Barton editorially. June 27, in an editorial headed "Bartonian Boldness," it applauded many Barton ideas; over the story of the Republican convention it put the heading "Barton in Keynote Speech, Attacks 'Corrupt' Democrats." Corrupt was in quotation marks, but it was in big type. Another editorial said the speech carried "much sane practical good sense. . . . We like his pointed warning. . . . We like his renewed emphasis. . . ." In short, The World-Telegram likes.

But with the New Deal's Mr. Liebman it is different. No editorials, and in fact almost no news items. But so much space is given Barton that the reader must gain the impression that Barton is Howard's candidate—just as he is Howard's advertising representative.

The same situation exists on The Journal-American. The taboo, however, was broken for one edition at least on August 18, when a two-column feature head announced that Mrs. Liebman would fly her own plane writing "Vote for Liebman" in smoke or steam in the neutral metropolitan skies. It was a good story. But it was yanked in the second edition and since then no Liebman story has appeared.

The advertising money Barton controls ranges all the way from cheese to steel; his clients include Borden, duPont, General Electric, R. H. Macy, Niagara Hudson, Remington Rand, several of the largest banks and U. S. Steel. For several corporations Barton is public-relations counselor and writer of good-will advertising meant to influence not pocketbooks but public opinion.

The man who controls Remington Rand is also the author of the Mohawk Valley Formula for smashing labor. Niagara Hudson is the corporation most implicated in the recent fight for control of Niagara power which marked the Constitutional Convention. Rand is anti-labor; Niagara Hudson is anti-public ownership, and their mouthpiece is the same Bruce Barton who places corporation advertising and who, by no strange coincidence, gets the big space in the press of the state.

Barton and J. Walter Thompson share the bulk of the J. P. Morgan Company advertising accounts. Barton has had Coolidge and Hoover as clients, and also the Republican Party.

The Guild Reporter, official organ of our organized newspaper men, indignantly reported, on July 1, 1936, that it had intercepted a 64-page propaganda booklet issued by the Republican National Committee for the purpose of attacking the Roosevelt administration and disparaging the New Deal. The Reporter said

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is not surprising that suggestions from an advertiser to a publisher concerning news are rarely coercive, but more like a "memo" to another in the same concern. . . . This "memo" was sent by Bruce Barton, chairman of the board of Batten, Barton, Durstine and Osborn, distributors of an enormous amount of advertising, to the business managers of many newspapers. Mr. Barton . . . clipped to the pamphlet his business card. There was no note explicitly urging the material be used. But under the copyright line in the pamphlet appeared "Permission to quote in part from this book is hereby granted," and doubtless the publishers got the idea.

Broun, the Guild's president, was among the first to charge the press with bowing "to the head of a large advertising agency which might have favors to distribute" (The New Republic, December 22, 1937).

The magazines also discuss Barton as a senatorial candidate, as Governor of New York, and eventually our President. As one advertising copywriter remarked, if you can put over five cents' worth of alcohol and castor oil as a dollar hair tonic which millions of fooled Americans believe grows hair, then why not advertise Bruce Barton into the White House? It all depends upon what the trade calls the "medium." In this case it is the American press. And apparently Barton's got it.

GEORGE SELDES

Due Process of Law

THE PRISONER was convicted of murder in the first degree. He was sentenced to death but the penalty was commuted to life imprisonment.

SIX MONTHS LATER—THE STATE COURT

"There has been brought to our attention a paper filed . . . by the Attorney General. . . . It is stated therein by the Attorney General:

I hereby stipulate and consent that the judgment and order heretofore entered in this case by the trial court be reversed and the cause remanded for a new trial.

. . .

"We do not read the paper so filed . . . as constituting anything more than a *mere consent* by the Attorney General that a reversal be had . . . the Court is not *now* called upon to determine whether any action in line with the consent of the Attorney General should or may be had . . . we will not consider the question of the advisability of the action suggested by the Attorney General's consent, except on *formal* application or motion by one of the parties addressed to the Court. . . ."

SEVEN MONTHS LATER—THE STATE COURT

"In advance of the hearing of the appeal on the merits, the defendant has made a motion that the judgment and order be reversed, solely on the ground that the Attorney General of the state has filed in this court a stipulation and consent that, for reasons stated therein, such action should be had by this court, and that defendant joins in said stipulation.

"The *sole* reason for this action on the part of the Attorney General . . . is that . . . certain evidence has been discovered which leads him and the judge . . . to believe that, *in the interests of justice,* a new trial should be had. [All italics mine.—S. S.]

. . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a criminal case, except for legal grounds appearing on a record duly presented, is not judicial. . . .

"*We have not considered the reasons stated by the Attorney General* for his conclusion that a new trial should be had, and are not to be understood as expressing any opinion as to their sufficiency. That . . . is a matter not within our province.

". . . Motion . . . denied."

THIRTEEN MONTHS LATER—THE STATE COURT

". . . This appeal is from the judgment and from the order denying his (prisoner's) motion for a new trial.

. . .

"Counsel insist that the stories of these two witnesses (for the prosecution) are so inconsistent that they could not possibly have been testifying about the same persons. Their stories, counsel say, are self-destructive, and therefore, a verdict based in part upon their testimony should be set aside. *Even if their stories were vitally contradictory, it would not follow that this court could disturb the judgment. . . .*

"*From the record before us* . . . we cannot find that he was deprived of any right, statutory or constitutional, or that any material error of law was committed calling for a reversal of the judgment or an abrogation of the order denying his motion for a new trial.

"Judgment (of conviction) . . . affirmed."

ONE YEAR, FIVE MONTHS LATER—THE STATE COURT

"The defendant applies to the court for a certificate of probable cause on his appeal from an order of the Superior Court denying his motion to set aside the judgment and sentence heretofore pronounced against him.

". . . The grounds of the motion involved in this appeal . . . are that the verdict of the jury, the order denying a new trial, the judgment, and the sentence, were procured through the willful nonfeasance mal

and his assistants, who conducted the prosecution . . . whereby defendant was deprived of a fair and impartial trial, and which prevented a fair submission of the cause. *These general averments are not sufficient* as a charge of fraud, under any rule of pleading, civil or criminal, known to our law. . . .

"The remedy in such case is by motion for a new trial, and if newly discovered evidence is too late in its production, its consideration cannot be brought about under the guise of a motion to vacate the judgment upon the ground of fraud. *The defendant in such case is without remedy. In this state it is settled law that a judgment cannot be set aside because it is predicated upon perjured testimony, or because material evidence is concealed or suppressed.* . . .

"Nor can it be said that the duty of a district attorney differs in the trial of criminal actions from that of counsel in civil actions. . . . If that obligation be violated, and perjured testimony produced, or material evidence suppressed by either, as we have seen, in so far as the judgment is concerned, the injured party is without remedy.

". . . Application . . . denied."

ONE YEAR, NINE MONTHS LATER—UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

"Petition for a writ of certiorari . . . denied."

SEVENTEEN YEARS, THREE MONTHS LATER—A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT

"Briefly stated, the basic grounds alleged in the petition for the writ (of habeas corpus) are as follows:

"That the conviction and imprisonment of petitioner were obtained by the state solely by perjured testimony which was known by the state's prosecuting officer to be perjured when offered in the trial. . . .

"That the state has since admitted that the testimony upon which such convicion was obtained was perjured. . . .

". . . The exceptional cases in which a federal court or judge may sometimes *appropriately interfere* by habeas corpus in advance of final action by the authorities of the state *are those of great urgency, that require to be promptly disposed of*; . . . The present case is not within any of the exceptions recognized in our former decisions.

. . .

"Petition denied."

SEVENTEEN YEARS, FIVE MONTHS LATER—UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

"From orders dismissing the petition and denying the petitioner's application for an appeal to the Circuit Court of Appeals, the petitioner brings a petition for a certificate of probable cause and for an appeal.

the judgment of the state court became final. *During all these years petitioner has suffered imprisonment in the state penitentiary.* . . .

"The fact that petitioner did not learn of the alleged perjured testimony and of the alleged misconduct of the district attorney who prosecuted him until it was too late to assign same as grounds for a new trial, *is indeed unfortunate.*

. . .

"The petition is denied."

SEVENTEEN YEARS, ELEVEN MONTHS LATER—UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

"Such a contrivance by a state (the pretense of a trial which in truth is but used as a means of depriving a defendant of liberty through a deliberate deception of court and jury by the presentation of testimony known to be perjured) to procure the conviction and imprisonment of a defendant is . . . inconsistent with the rudimentary demands of justice. . . .

. . .

"Orderly procedure, governed by principles we have repeatedly announced, requires that before this court is asked to issue a writ of habeas corpus, in the case of a person held under a state commitment, recourse should be had to whatever judicial remedy afforded by the state may still remain open. . . .

". . . Leave to file the petition is denied. . . ."

TWENTY YEARS, EIGHT MONTHS LATER—THE STATE COURT AGAIN

"By this proceeding in habeas corpus, the petitioner . . . seeks his release from the custody of the warden of the state prison . . . where he is confined pursuant to a judgment on a verdict finding him guilty of murder of the first degree.

". . . *proof of perjury alone*, without satisfactory proof of knowledge thereof or connivance therein by the prosecuting officials, *can avail the petitioner nothing in this proceeding.* . . .

"However, while knowledge of the contents of these reports may have assisted the defense in their cross-examination of ————, we do not attach the significance or materiality to said reports that petitioner does. The descriptions therein *merely* inaccurately stated the heights, weights and ages of the persons involved.

". . . The petitioner is remanded."

TWENTY-ONE YEARS, EIGHT MONTHS LATER—THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AGAIN

"Thomas J. Mooney, petitioner

v.

Court Smith, warden of San Quentin Penitentiary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shoot the Works

"Kiss the Bourgeoisie Goodbye"

RED-BAITING has been going on at such a lively pace of late that I hate to add my own mild whisper to the din. And yet as a patriot I cannot quite keep to myself the vague fear that possibly Clare Boothe, author of "Kiss the Boys Goodbye," may be a Communist rigged up in a disguise.

It is quite true that I possess no direct evidence to support my case but under the present rules a mere suspicion is enough to entitle a witness to a passport good for a round-trip ride all the way up to the throne of Mr. Martin Dies himself.

So, being duly sworn, I wish to point out that Miss Boothe with a popular play has far greater potentialities for subversive activity than John Strachey could possibly exert in a lecture. I do not think the author will dare to deny that she attacks American institutions in her little *hocus opus*. She holds up to ridicule not only the American house party but also our free press, the motion-picture industry and the glorious Southland itself.

Naturally, the playwright does not step out upon the stage in person and make these criticisms in her own right. She is too crafty for that. Miss Boothe bores from within. One of the characters in the play serves as her stooge and mouthpiece. Mr. Congressman, I submit that when all the good lines in a play are assigned to a single character and the rest excluded it stands to reason that the fictional figure in question must of a certainty be teacher's pet.

Nor is there any concealment of the fellow's motivation. He is presented frankly as a radical columnist. The author does not go into the problem as to whether or not he is also pseudonymously a Communist. That would be tipping her mitt too much, although the columnist (I believe his stage name is Breed) is mentioned as having some kind of connection with an organization known as the CIO.

But for the most part the menace of the man is muffled. Miss Boothe is far too clever to split the heart of the plate with her propaganda. She works the corners. For her own fell purposes she cloaks the heroic qualities of her radical hero. He is endowed with protective coloration. In fact he is preserved in alcohol. The audience does not realize that it has been listening to a revolutionary tract until it gets home and begins to think.

Breed is presented as tipsy, slovenly, superficial and as a cad who has been known to kiss and tell. His most eloquent tirade against fascism is delivered while he waves a whiskey bottle in his right hand. Or maybe it is his left. When he attacks the economic and social structure of the South, the heroine butts him in the stomach and knocks him out. But though his abdomen may be weak, his cerebellum remains true blue. On the surface it may seem as if his preachment consists of nothing more than maudlin mutters. This is part of the sneak-up. No censor would think of finding high ideals and dangerous doctrine con[illegible]

familiar technique of the Trojan horse, although slightly reversed in this experiment.

Miss Boothe is not altogether an innovator in the method which she had devised for flanking her adversaries. As a scholar she can translate at sight the phrase "in vino veritas." She knows that it means, "Truth like water is easier to take if you have something on the side." With few exceptions, straight radical plays do not succeed on Broadway. If Miss Boothe had pictured her revolutionist as austere and saintlike she might have scored an artistic success but a propaganda failure.

Some years ago when I was both a Socialist and a dramatic critic, a fellow traveler in the Party approached me and said, "Comrade Broun, I have a swell idea for a play which I feel sure will help the movement." I told him cordially that some time or other I would like to hear it. He said, "I've got it with me," and pulled the manuscript out of his pocket. "It's called 'The Life of Norman Thomas.' "

"There you've got something," I assured him. "That title has 'box office' written all over it."

But the first act seemed a little slow to me, since it was all in pantomime. It was a scene in which Mr. Thomas, a young clergyman, encounters the works of Karl Marx in a public library on Lexington Avenue. The playwright admitted that it might take a bit of playing because, as he explained, he hoped to hold the attention of the audience by the play of the expression on the actor's face. "He gets more and more rapt as he goes on and finally when he comes to the theory of the class struggle he rises and walks out into the night a dedicated man."

The last act was a Socialist rally in Columbus Circle.

I told my friend that I was afraid commercial managers might shy away from it on the ground that it was too hot to handle. And, as far as I know, my judgment proved sound, because to the best of my knowledge the play has not yet been produced. And even if it had been put on I gravely suspect that most of the patrons would have come from the ranks of the already persuaded.

Broadway managers do not shy away from the works of Miss Clare Boothe and many of the persons who come to see her plays are not yet converted to the necessity of fundamental economic changes. It is possible for her to break new ground and even sow the seed in pastures which have hitherto been looked upon as stony places. Miss Boothe realizes that it is her special mission to bring the light to the bourgeoisie and so she has incorporated her subversive doctrines in a farce fit for the boobs. A hundred years and yet another may pass before a brave new world fully appreciates the sacrifice which Clare Boothe has made for the cause. Indeed, she has made the supreme sacrifice which lies within the capacity of any literary figure. She has compromised her artistic integrity in order to get her message over.

In the silence of her lonely room I imagine Miss Boothe mulled over the fact that with "The Women" she had established herself as Park Avenue's gift to belles-lettres. "How can I sell my birthright," she pondered, "to aid the revolution?" Her eyes grew misty. Then she cried, "Let them eat good red borscht, but in order to have it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

The GOP Is Betrayed

THE MOST CURIOUS PART of the present election campaign is the sharply divided position taken by big business. A good part of the country's industrialists appear to be cold-shouldering the Republican Party, and giving a wink to the New Deal. This was perhaps best demonstrated when Mr. Roosevelt, lightly disguised as the White House spokesman, asked business to cease saber-rattling. Immediately he was answered by Mr. Charles R. Hook of the American Rolling Mills, head of the National Association of Manufacturers, with a warm pledge of coöperation.

This is not the way the NAM behaved only two years ago. In the 1936 campaign, the NAM made a series of anti-Roosevelt talkies, and sent them through the Northeastern states with sound trucks. It furnished slips to be put in workers' pay envelopes, warning them that their jobs would be endangered by Mr. Roosevelt's reëlection. The NAM would have no more admitted that coöperation was possible with Mr. Roosevelt than it would with a Molokai Island leper. The chief argument of Messrs. Hoover, Vandenberg, Barton and other Republican spokesmen has been that prosperity and full employment cannot be attained under the New Deal. Mr. Hook's statement—made on the eve of a national election—leaves them standing on thin air. It is a knife-blow between the Republican Party's emaciated ribs.

It is unnecessary to point out that a large number of industrialists, perhaps a majority, feel as bitterly about Mr. Roosevelt as they ever did. In Pennsylvania and Ohio, for example, corporation heads like Messrs. Pew, Weir and Girdler are backing Republican candidates with ferocious energy. The fact is, nevertheless, that the New Deal now has a sizable herd of tame capitalists. The first of the breed, Mr. Vincent Astor, escaped—or more accurately was dragged from his enclosure by Mr. Raymond Moley—in the early days of the New Deal. For some time thereafter, Mr. W. Averill Harriman, chairman of the Union Pacific and famous polo-player, was the New Deal's chief specimen. He proved to be a remarkable decoy, and has toled in many wilder brethren.

A fragmentary list of converts would include: Mr. Carl C. Conway of Continental Can, Mr. Paul Shields, Wall Street broker, Mr. Floyd Odlum of Atlas Corporation, all of whom have collaborated with the SEC in various matters; Mr. Clarence M. Woolley of American Radiator, Mr. Lewis H. Brown of Johns-Manville, who have advised on housing; General Robert E. Wood of Sears, Roebuck, a consultant on federal procurement methods; Mr. Donald M. Nelson, also of Sears, Roebuck, an adviser on the administration of the wages-and-hours law; Mr. Edward R. Stettinius of U. S. Steel, Mr. William L. Batt of SKF Industries, who have interested themselves in the monopoly investigation.

The oddest figure in the group is Mr. Prentiss L. Coonman a great part of whose life has been spent in the heavy industries that are supposed to be the chief victims of New Deal policy. Shortly after Congress voted the monopoly inquiry, Mr. Coonley arrived in Washington, rented a house and began giving dinners at which New Dealers and industrialists met face to face. Mr. Coonley would perhaps not agree that he is a lobbyist, but he has cheerfully acknowledged that his job is to smooth over conflicts between the administration and the great corporations that sent him here. If the monopoly committee wishes data for its investigation, Mr. Coonley has announced, please ask him and he will see they are forthcoming. He has shown that he understands the low-price-high-production philosophy of the New Deal, and has promised, if any industry is found to be raising its prices unduly, to speak a few words in the right places.

The White House advisers, not unnaturally, observed Mr. Coonley with considerable suspicion. Mr. Coonley has now been in Washington about five months, and, according to a highly placed New Dealer, has "played square." Among other facts about him, it has been discovered that he is vice-president of a foundation to promote the work of Dr. Austen Riggs, head of a sanatorium visited by wealthy and famous persons at Stockbridge, Massachusetts. Assuming that, by some process of osmosis, Mr. Coonley has acquired the skill of Dr. Riggs, there is an uneasy doubt in the minds of New Dealers about who are supposed to be his patients—themselves or the industrialists.

It is difficult to pass judgment on this unexpected nuzzling-up to the New Deal by a substantial section of big business. A few business men, no doubt, may be entirely altruistic in their motives, and may sincerely sympathize with the New Deal's aims. One such man, to all appearances, is Mr. John W. Hanes, member of a great tobacco-manufacturing family, a Wall Street broker and now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. It may be suspected, however, that more of them are looking strictly for their own advantage. Business, as a whole, has taken two lickings from Mr. Roosevelt, in 1934 and 1936. Some of the most astute business leaders appear to have decided that, rather than fight a third battle, it would be more intelligent to see what could be accomplished by behind-the-scenes diplomacy. Washington observers think they have partial confirmation of this change in policy in the proposals of business publications, like McGraw-Hill's Business Week, and Fortune, that "business sell itself to the public." A cardinal element of these proposals is that business must not attack Mr. Roosevelt, but must offer to coöperate along "sound lines." An inescapable conclusion, however, is that business, at least for the immediate future, despairs of the Republican Party.

According to the more cynical observers here, Mr. Roosevelt's interest in the spy menace means chiefly that the old master has not lost his skill. The country has become aroused about spying because of the Czech crisis, still more because of the Dies investigation. Despite his continuous lapses into comedy—or because of them—Mr. Dies has proved the greatest grabber of newspaper space since the late Representative Marion Zioncheck, and many of the stories have had a savage anti-New Deal bias. By proposing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dies's efforts. Some months ago, Mr. Roosevelt came out flat-footed against the kidnaping of small children, and had a magnificent press; a strong stand against foreign spies should be helpful now. Of such things is politics made. T. R. B.

Washington

Other People's Money

For Bigger and Better Monopolies

PROFESSOR CHARLES BEARD felt deeply enough stirred some weeks ago to write in The New Republic in a tone of great impatience about the trust-busting racket in general and the coming investigation in particular. Whenever Professor Beard feels moved to write about anything, what emerges commands the attention and respect of this writer. I, too, feel myself in a state of growing impatience with the monopoly probers in Washington. But I fear my reactions to the goings-on there are somewhat different.

Professor Beard lays down a thesis which, as I get it, runs about as follows:

There are fundamental elements in the processes of human history which are inexorable. The trend now in these processes is toward a vast, integrated, technological system. The anti-trust warriors have ignored this. The trust investigations of the past have revealed all that is to be known about bigness. Despite all this, the trusts have grown in number and size.

Now we are to have another investigation. It will bring forth nothing new, no broad policy respecting bigness. We are to have just another old-fashioned anti-trust comedy.

No one will question the presence of powerful underlying forces in human society which drive it inevitably in one direction. For many years the perfection of machinery, the development of new instruments of finance and the fabrication of that inexhaustible engine of association known as the corporation, plus the growing appetite of men for a richer and more abundant life, have determined the direction, tempo and policies of organized societies everywhere.

It is, however, hardly true that the anti-trust investigations of the past have told us all we need to know about bigness. They have exposed enough and to spare of the human injustices, the personal cruelties of the trust promoters and of the havoc wrought upon the fortunes of their competitors and victims. But the economic and technological values of bigness have, so far as I have been able to discover, been explored hardly at all. There has been a widely publicized acceptance of the assumption that mass production upon a continental scale is the wisest and most efficient way in which to use the machines we have devised for society. But the subject has by no means been seriously studied.

There is a large body of thought by able technicians, wholly unconcerned with the social factors in the equation, that scientific management upon a less colossal scale than has been popular is a far more intelligent technique for exploiting our modern inventions. As for the economic effect of big- its effects upon society. I am not thinking of what Dr. Beard calls the continental pattern compared with the small handicraft system. There is no contest between the great shoe producer spread in an immense horizontal and vertical integration all over the map on one side and the village cobbler on the other.

Nor have the trust investigations of the past done more than scratch the surface of the economic consequences of our present corporation laws.

Whether the coming investigation will undertake to examine these questions intelligently is another matter. Let us at least hope it will, while feeling all the time, as Dr. Beard well says, that the facts which the investigators unearth may well be those which correspond with the ideas and bias with which they begin.

However, the point upon which I am most disposed to be skeptical is Dr. Beard's feeling that nothing new will emerge from this investigation. I am profoundly fearful that something quite new will come out of it—something we are hardly bargaining for.

I have followed as closely as possible the course of the investigation thus far. It seems to me quite plain that those groups which seem to be most influential—the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce and the President's own agents—have a very definite idea in their minds. If there is one trend obvious now in the whole course of social phenomena, it is the general conviction that the economic system must be controlled in order to produce the most desirable results. And how it will be managed will depend upon the agency which achieves the right to do the managing. Another trend arises out of the well fostered belief that the proper agency to direct our economic life, which is improperly called our business life, is organized business itself. There is a growing conviction that our economic society should be divided into great provinces which will be subdivided into lesser cantons and that in these the legislation and administration will be in the hands of bodies set up by organized business groups. Of course there is the concession of a government supervision of all this. But there is belief that the less the government intrudes into the process the better. And we may feel assured that if we ever enter upon this course the government will intrude very little, for these groups will presently be the government.

This is the idea which these investigators have in their minds. I have not the slightest doubt that these are the ideas they will seek to establish into policy. They keep up a chatter about the evils of monopoly. But their real objective is the resurrection of the NRA. No man who has read their speeches or heard their conversation can doubt this.

This is no old-fashioned trust investigation to scotch the trusts. The villain which will emerge from it will be not the trusts but competition. The devices suggested will be devices to produce more monopolies. If these men succeed, of course what they propose will be some more or less mild and experimental step in the direction of controlling competition—production, prices, practices—not in the interest of that abundance Dr. Beard desires but of scarcity to increase profits. But having set its foot upon that course the nation will find itself caught up in one of those inexorable processes already described and thereafter we shall continue to march

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Biography and Theatre

The Fabulous Invalid, by Moss Hart and George S. Kaufman. Broadhurst Theatre, October 8, 1938.
Oscar Wilde, by Leslie and Sewell Stokes. Fulton Theatre, October 10, 1938.

THE INVALID that Messrs. Hart and Kaufman present as fabulous is, of course, the theatre; and the story follows the career of a single example, the Alexandria—a composite of Daly's, Belasco's, the Fourteenth Street Theatre, etc.—built, loved and managed by a certain Carleton, likewise a composite. On the opening night the leading lady dies of the triumph's excitement, and her husband, the leading man, kills himself for grief. After that their ghosts, accompanied by the ghost of the old doorman, wander about the theatres, haunt the Alexandria especially, and make a peg on which to hang the chorus to its drama.

Presently we see the manager's ruin, the decline of the theatre in general for one cause and another at one time and another—they put it down to the market crash, the automobile, the moving pictures, the radio and what not; there is every sort of alibi within the theatre itself for its ebbing fortunes.

The façade of the Alexandria, meanwhile—admirably done by Mr. Donald Oenslager, all of whose many settings for the play are successful—in all its changing aspects, from the palatial *de luxe*, through vaudeville and then burlesque, to windows boarded up and hot-dog stands, is made to record these many changes, respectively, in fortune. The theme of the play, nevertheless, is that the theatre is dead, long live the theatre; and the motif by which the plot is resolved is a happy invention, and one that avoids any tricky fabrication or sweetish sentiment for a dénouement. After the street side, with its final sordid ruin, we see the bare stage again for the last scene, and a company of young people enter—it may be an old place and so on, no matter, they have their theatre. The three ghosts, who have preferred the theatres on earth to heaven but are about to depart in despair, will stay on for a while.

The play, frankly packed with theatre stuff of every variety and appeal, runs engagingly throughout the many scenes. Some of them are reminiscent, flashes of costume and impersonation from favorite stage successes of the last forty years or so, and some a plainer realism from today. Only at moments does it seem to go slow, because, perhaps, of too much sheer exposition where more of indirect suggestion would brighten up the time.

"The Fabulous Invalid" suffers a good deal, however, from the performance. With Miss Doris Dalton and Mr. Stephen Courtleigh as Carleton's stars and the subsequent ghosts, however handsome, it is impossible to believe in any very distinguished or glamorous qualities for this older theatre from which the decline is traced. With a few exceptions, the impersonations out of the past are nothing to speak of; though here it may be possible that Mr. Kaufman did not wish to have performances whose cleverness might distract too much of our attention and to that extent slow up the story. Mr. John Hambleton's costumes failed sadly in many of the earlier bits from the past for a very simple craft reason: the foundation of the costume was expensive, was a total failure for lack of corsets. The costumes otherwise were innumerable, lavish and effective.

The play about Oscar Wilde is a series of episodes, plainly chosen with discretion, taste and acting possibilities, from his ill starred life. How much these episodes flow into a play of considerable unity and value would be hard for me to say. I cannot tell how far I am filling in with the knowledge I already have of Oscar Wilde's writings and life, especially the biography by Frank Harris, from which so much apparently is taken directly. Certainly the play affords a chance to exhibit, most adroitly and never vulgarly, a surprising number of the Wilde epigrams and witticisms. And certainly it is a remarkable vehicle for Mr. Robert Morley's superb acting of this role.

The Stokeses have chosen as their material a scene during Oscar Wilde's visit to Lord Alfred Douglas in Algiers, a scene with a young jockey in a private room in a London restaurant, followed by an ominous scene in Oscar Wilde's study, where Frank Harris is shown trying to warn his friend away from disaster, and a blackmailer comes with a stolen letter to Lord Alfred Douglas; two famous scenes at the Old Bailey, from the trial of the Marquis of Queensbury, in the libel suit brought by Wilde; and then Wilde's own trial; a scene in his study where he returns from two years in prison to find that socially his punishment is not yet to be ended and plans to leave for France; and then finally the Paris café, with the drink, the old ways resumed, the visits of Lord Alfred Douglas and Frank Harris, absinthe again and oblivion. Note that the authors stop here and do not exploit the easy effectiveness of Wilde's death. In the same way they exploit none of the risqué, morbid or itching potentialities of Wilde's career, never resort to the appeal of false sentiment. And so on that basis they may feel justified in leaving out the sunflower note, the satin knee breeches and other affectations and flagrancies, variously vulgar, characteristic and notorious. The result is a dignified, witty and honest piece of writing, about which we may say that the tearful is wholly lacking, and the pathetic deepened and widened beyond the actual person and moment.

Mr. Morley's performance has all these virtues of the script carried farther, plus great penetration into the most significant meanings of the role, and poise and brilliance in the execution. The security and power in the comprehension, then, are to be so much taken for granted that we may as well turn to the technical. His very distinct and rather slow speech enables this actor to give to the epigrams and the repartee their full value without seeming to be underscoring them or pushing them on us. From his very first entrance, Mr. Morley made Oscar Wilde, as he gave his little show, turn from one person to another with a smile that seemed to say he hoped they were enjoying it as much as he did; thereby he curiously disarmed us of any resentment of any conceit, exhibitionism or fatuity. He introduced this same device later into the trial scenes, where it led into an effect of frivolity and rash vanity that helped to ruin him there. And the many transitions were so finely achieved that he created the complete sense that in everything Wilde did or said, creditable or ruinous, reckless or flippant, or serious and profound, he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficult and essential of all Mr. Morley's achievements in the role.

Mr. John Buckmaster's Lord Alfred Douglas and Mr. John Carol's Charlie Parker, the jockey, were well done. Mr. Raymond Sovey's five settings were capital.

STARK YOUNG

The Bandwagon

At the end of the meeting there was no vote of thanks, no "God Save the King!" In the handbills the list of speakers included an archdeacon, who was not mentioned as "the Venerable" but as "Rev." Are Taunton pacifists civilized Englishmen? – *News item in The Somerset County, England, Gazette, quoted in The New Statesman.*

Labor must take cut, says Clement [president of the Pennsylvania Railroad]. He said the officials of his road took a 31-percent reduction in 1932 when the workers' wages were reduced 10 percent. . . . He stated that his salary as president of the Pennsylvania was $100,000, which was $50,000 less than the office formerly paid. – *From a news item in The New York Times.*

Whereas, by the provisions of the State Civil Service Act "improper political activity" upon the part of a civil servant is cause for his dismissal from the service; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the State Personnel Board, that the particular attention of all persons in the state civil service be and the same is hereby directed to the provisions of the statute prohibiting "improper political activity" and strict observance thereof enjoined.

Be it further resolved, that the attention of all persons in the state civil service be directed to the intention of the Board to adopt a rule at its next meeting defining in detail the meaning of "improper political activity." – *From a letter issued by the California State Personnel Board.*

Why Not Turn on the Shower?

Persons who hear the national anthem played over the radio in their homes should stand at attention only if the circumstances do not make that action forced and unnatural, it was said yesterday by Colonel James A. Moss, president general of the United States Flag Association. . . . "If eating at a table, talking over the telephone, playing cards, cooking a meal or taking a bath, standing at attention would be forced and unnatural and therefore should not be done." – *From a news item in The New York Times.*

Flatterer!

Clark is particularly close to Garner. In 1933, when Clark came to the Senate, a discussion arose in a Cabinet meeting as to what manner of man he was. All eyes were turned to Garner. . . . The Vice President, in homely frontier idiom, bestowed a Texan's highest praise. "If I were going to rob a train," he said, "and I had to choose an accomplice from the United States Senate, I would pick Bennett Clark." – *From an article about United States Senator Bennett Champ Clark in The Saturday Evening Post.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

America in the Next War

SIR: In your issue dated October 5 you have an editorial dealing with the part America must play if war comes. In this editorial you advocate the partial repeal of the provision of the Neutrality Act of 1937, which prohibits exports from this country to belligerents, of arms, ammunition and implements of war, and you advocate permitting military airplanes to be sold to belligerents on a cash-and-carry basis. At the same time you oppose the repeal of the balance of the provision prohibiting the sales of arms and ammunition. Is there any sound reason for distinguishing between military airplanes on the one hand, and arms and ammunition and other implements of war on the other? Should not the prohibition be repealed as to all, and should not sales of all be permitted on a cash-and-carry basis?

The arguments against such repeal are twofold: first, that it might create controversies with belligerents about their efforts to stop shipments of munitions to their enemies; and, second, that it would create a large economic interest dependent upon war customers. The first argument does not apply to sales of military airplanes. As you well say in your editorial, if the sales are permitted only on a cash-and-carry basis there would be no danger of our becoming embroiled through interruption of shipments.

With respect to the second argument, it likewise does not apply with any greater force to the sales of arms and munitions than to the sales of military airplanes. If war were to come between France and England on the one hand and Germany on the other, there would inevitably be developed in this country a large economic interest dependent upon war customers. This would result, as you yourself point out in your editorial, from the sales of "automobiles, trucks, wheat, chemicals, oil and a wide array of commodities." Our economic interest dependent upon war customers would be so great in any event that it would not be materially increased, as you yourself recognize, by the sales of military airplanes, nor would it be if, in addition, sales of arms and munitions were permitted on a cash-and-carry basis.

While at the date of writing this letter it appears as though the threat of war had been removed, nevertheless the danger

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very outset do all in its power, short of entering the hostilities, to aid the cause of England and France. Whether at a later date the United States should enter the hostilities is a question which at the moment need not be answered.

The repeal of the prohibition in the Neutrality Act against exports to belligerents, of arms, ammunition and implements of war, is a matter of such vital importance that I hope that, on further consideration, you will agree that the distinction which you make between arms and ammunition on the one hand, and military airplanes on the other, is not justified, and that you will use the influence of The New Republic to help bring about the repeal of the provision in question.

EUSTACE SELIGMAN

New York City

SIR: You are to be commended for including John T. Flynn's clear, objective, question-raising inquiry, on "The President's Foreign Policy," in your September 28 issue. Need I do more than quote from Flynn's final paragraph? "Nations do not go to war suddenly, overnight. They go one step at a time. The first step is taken quietly and unnoticed. The other steps follow equally unnoticed until a situation is created when no choice is left but war."

One week later you write: "Hitler and his friends might, and undoubtedly would, resent this enormous help that his foes were receiving from us, but they would have no legal grounds for objecting on the basis of a law adopted long before the crisis arose, and technically applying with equal force to all belligerents. And there would be little they could do to put a stop to it without actually attacking American soil. In the remote eventuality that they were both foolhardy enough and strong enough to try that, we should know what to do." Whereupon you suggest we make the alterations necessary, if need should arise, for the export of airplanes to France and Britain. Your conclusion is, finally, that any important modification of our "isolationist" policy "would surely be in the direction of active participation in war."

The New Republic's view on the matter of the European war is commendably outspoken. Whether or not that view is commendable is quite another matter. In your editorial of the October 5 issue your conclusion makes it quite clear that you give merely lip-service to the objective of neutrality, and regard our purpose rather as a repetition of "saving the world for democracy."

You mention with a startling simplicity that the Hitler powers would have no "legal grounds for objecting" to our policy, which you admit would favor the anti-Fascist allies. And what attention need we give the "legal grounds," basing our inferences on the last war?

Clearly our objective should be rather to bring raw materials within the category of articles, the export of which may be forbidden (*i.e*, alter Section 1; paragraph (d)) rather than to increase our exports to include aircraft, which is certainly inviting war to our own shore—*and which would at the same time make extremely difficult the success of your plan for keeping us free from dependence on war exports for the maintenance of our prosperity.*

I have just renewed subscription to The New Republic and am most disappointed to see the issue being beclouded rather than clarified.

Lincoln, Neb. THEODORE F. MARBURG

[To Mr. Seligman we reply that we advocated modification of the embargo on airplane exports only if investigation showed the ban would seriously handicap Hitler's enemies. Surely they would not have a pressing need to order other munitions from us, better than he does. Those objectives were (1) staying out of war, (2) doing nothing seriously to hamper the anti-Hitler allies. The economic help we should be giving these allies under the Neutrality Act would be an inevitable consequence of their preponderance of purchasing power in this country and of their control of the seas.

To both correspondents, we reply that the authority which we proposed to regulate the liquidation of foreign-owned securities would have as one of its main purposes the limitation of trade with belligerents to something like normal peacetime proportions and hence the prevention of a war boom and of the creation of a preponderant interest in war industries. Mr. Marburg evidently confuses legal neutrality with objective impartiality as between belligerents. If the latter is what he favors, it could be achieved only by cutting off exports entirely. The nation would be so disastrously affected by such an attempt that it is inconceivable as a practical policy.—THE EDITORS]

To Help Jerry O'Connell

SIR: No member of the last session of Congress more consistently supported the best American traditions of democracy than Congressman Jerry J. O'Connell of Montana. . . . I am not exaggerating when I say that Jerry's defeat would be in the nature of a national political catastrophe. Perhaps more than any other member of the liberal bloc in the House he combines an acute political sense with a rare kind of courage which makes him an invaluable element in bringing together otherwise clashing personalities. . . .

As pointed out in the "Washington Notes" of The New Republic for October 19, Senator Burton K. Wheeler, backed by the reactionary elements of the Montana Democratic Party and given unqualified support by the state press, owned and controlled largely by the Anaconda Copper Company, is determined to defeat Jerry at all costs. . . . Wheeler's machine maintained control of the recent State Democratic Convention, with the result that the State Committee refuses to give Jerry a cent to aid in his campaign, even though he won the Democratic nomination in the primaries. The most effective weapon he has is the radio, but Wheeler and his gang are rapidly buying up the best time. . . .

In such a situation I naturally turn to the readers of The New Republic for as much assistance as they can afford. . . . The performance of Wheeler and his crowd against Jerry is one of the dirtiest pieces of attempted political assassination I have ever encountered. We must not let it succeed.

GARDNER JACKSON

Chevy Chase, Md.

Dr. Bella Dodd

SIR: I believe that your readers in New York City, and most especially in the 10th A.D., will be interested in knowing something of the American Labor Party candidate for the Assembly in that district, Dr. Bella V. Dodd.

Dr. Dodd, until recently an instructor in Political Science and History at Hunter College and continuing as a member of the New York Bar, is one of the truly progressive leaders among the women of New York. Since 1935 the legislative representative of the New York Teachers' Union at Albany, she has devoted her life to fighting, not only for the rights of teachers and for the improvement of conditions in the schools for the children, but for the right to organization of nurses' groups, especially in their struggle for the eight-hour day, and generally for the improvement of the status of working women throughout the city and state.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

urge every voter to familiarize himself with Dr. Dodd's achievements and program by getting in touch with the campaign headquarters of the 10th A.D., 77 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

New York City GROFF CONKLIN

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Arnoff Vanecek writes from Prague that he and many others have faith in the Czech democracy and believe that Hitler's regime will collapse in a short time and that Czechoslovakia will survive. . . . Jack Fahy sends us his letter of resignation from the Socialist Party of America, criticizing it for "the damage it has done" to the cause of the Spanish Republic, from which Mr. Fahy has just returned after eighteen months in the International Brigades.

The School of Living, an adult research and educational school concerned with the problems of salary earning and family living, sends us the announcement that the school reopened on September 26 at Suffern, New York. It was founded in 1934 by Ralph Borsodi. . . . Nathalie B. Manning, of the War Resisters' League, informs us of letters of protest being sent to M. Paul Henri Spaak, Prime Minister of Belgium, on behalf of Henri and Constant Spiessens, two young brothers who have been imprisoned for refusal of military service. . . . The first issue of The Contemporary Jewish Record, a new "review of events and opinion" to be published on a non-profit basis by the American Jewish Committee, is sent us by its managing editor, A. G. Duker.

I. Krechevsky, the secretary of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, sends us a resolution of the society condemning the Nazi treatment of science and scientists and urging the transfer of the twelfth International Congress of Psychology, to be held in 1941, away from the formerly selected site, Vienna. . . . Helen Hall of the Social Workers' Committee to aid Spanish Democracy, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York City, announces a dinner in honor of Constance Kyle, Thursday, October 27, at the Town Hall Club. Professor Harold J. Laski will be the guest speaker.

What's on the Air?

Elmer F. Andrews, Wages-and-Hours Administrator, talks about the new act, Sunday, October 23, 1:45 P.M., CBS.

Dr. Francisco Castillo Najera, Mexican Ambassador to the United States, speaks on a program devoted to the Eighth International Conference of American States, Sunday, October 23, 7 P.M., NBC-Blue Network.

The Herald Tribune's Eighth Annual Forum discusses: "Shall We Break with Tradition?" Tuesday, October 25, 2 P.M.; "Business and Government," Wednesday, October 26, 2 P.M.; "War Over the World," Wednesday, October 26, 9 P.M.; and "The World of Tomorrow," Thursday, October 27, 12 noon, all on the NBC-Blue Network.

Musical and dramatic programs of the week include Arturo Toscanini conducting the NBC Symphony Orchestra, Saturday, October 22, 10 P.M., NBC-Blue Network; John Barbirolli conducting the Philharmonic Symphony of New York, Sunday, October 23, 3 P.M., CBS; a dramatization of "The Talisman" by Sir Walter Scott, presented by the Mercury Theatre of the Air, Sunday, October 23, 8 P.M., CBS; Archibald MacLeish's original radio play, "Air Raid," starring Aline MacMahon and Orson Welles, Thursday, October 27, 10 P.M., CBS; and the San Francisco Opera Company's production of Verdi's "La Forza del Destino," Friday, October 28, 12 midnight, NBC-Blue Network.

DECIDE FOR YOURSELF

WHETHER OR NOT

THE SOUTH

IS THE NATION'S NO. 1 ECONOMIC PROBLEM

YOU'VE SEEN this land . . . white in eastern Carolina . . . red in the hills of Georgia . . . black in the delta-lands of Mississippi.

YOU'VE SEEN it . . . through your windshield, driving down U. S. 1 . . . through the train windows of the Seaboard's Southern States Special to Miami, of the Southern's Crescent Limited to New Orleans . . . looking down from Eastern Air Lines' Douglas'.

YOU'VE SEEN its people . . . through Bourke-White's photographs . . . through Pare Lorenz' film of its epic river . . . through Clarence Cason's and Erskine Caldwell's and Jonathan Daniels' probing of their spirit.

TO HELP YOU DECIDE FOR YOURSELF

AN ALABAMA BOY who picked cotton, farmed, clerked in a plantation store and rose to be the head of the department of history and political science of a leading Southern university has written a book about the South as he knows it, what is being done and what can be done. Not a simple panacea, but the thoughtful conclusions of a man who has never gotten away from his land and his people. A possible preview of the South of tomorrow.

FORTY ACRES AND STEEL MULES

BY HERMAN CLARENCE NIXON

With 145 photographic illustrations, $2.50

FORTY ACRES AND STEEL MULES and other books about the South published at Chapel Hill are on display in New York City at Brentano's, Putnam's, and the Association Press; in Chicago at Brentano's, Marshall Field's, and Kroch's; in Atlanta at Rich's; in Washington at Brentano's; in Seattle at Harry Hartman's; in San Francisco at Paul Elder's; in Cincinnati at John G. Kidd's; in Nashville at Stokes and Stockell; in Pasadena at Vroman's; in New Orleans at Hansell's; in Chattanooga at Payne's; in Philadelphia at Strawbridge & Clothier's; in Trenton at Traver's; in Hartford at Brentano's; in Portland, Maine at Campbell's; in Dallas at the Methodist Publishing House; in Providence at the Book Shop; in Albany at Clapp's; in Salt Lake City at Deseret's; in Pittsburgh at Joseph Horne's; in St. Louis at Scruggs-Vandervoort-Barney; in San Antonio at Joske's; and in Norfolk at the Beacon Book Shop.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Tribute to Ben Franklin

AMONG HIS OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS, almost as varied as Leonardo's, Benjamin Franklin was a great dramatist in terms of his own life and a great tragic and comic player. He applied the theory of the Mask, as it would later be expressed by William Butler Yeats. That is, a great man may overcome his weaknesses and redouble his influence by creating a false character for himself, based on exactly those qualities in which he is lacking. Franklin did more than that. He imagined and wrote and acted not merely one character but a whole series, so that it is hard to say which of them was the "real" Franklin.

He must have come nearest to revealing himself during his youth in Boston, when he was a printer's devil apprenticed to his brother James. At that time he was known to be proud, disputatious, even quarrelsome, and eager to excel. In his earliest writings he expressed two convictions that would later be softened or concealed without ever disappearing: his profound disbelief in revealed religion and his profound hatred for lords and royal officials. He regarded himself then and afterwards as a "leather-apron man," a mechanic bent on rising in the world without betraying his own class. Yet even in those Boston days he wrote for The Courant under an assumed name and character—as Prudence Dogood, the widow of a country clergyman.

By the time Franklin opened his own printing shop in Philadelphia, at the age of twenty-two, he had already created a new mask, one that he used not only in his writing but also in his daily life. He was now the honest tradesman, deferent to those in authority, including royal governors, and respectful to the churches whose power he still hoped to undermine. His pride was transformed into apparent humility, his contentiousness into silence; and his real industry became a part to be acted with gestures in the theatre of the streets. "I took care," he says, "not only to be in reality industrious and frugal but to avoid all appearances to the contrary. I was seen at no places of idle diversion. . . . To show that I was not above my business, I sometimes brought home the paper I purchased . . . in a wheelbarrow."

I am not suggesting that Franklin was a hypocrite, or even that he was insincere. He had the gift of judging himself clearsightedly, and with no more indulgence than he showed to others. But he had learned that seeming goes farther in the world than being and that public men are judged like actors, by the parts they play. Franklin played different parts in different countries. Two of those he assumed in later life—one in England, the other in France—were so effective that they helped to build a nation and change the course of European history.

He was in England from 1757 to 1762 and from 1764 to 1774, as an agent for Pennsylvania and three of the other colonies, including rebellious Massachusetts. But the chief role by the British ruling class, which wanted to flatter the colonies and persuade them to accept new taxes; the cheapest method of conciliation was to honor their most prominent representative. Franklin was elected to all the learned societies and given degrees by Edinburgh and Oxford; there was even talk of a baronetcy and a pension. But the ruling class also wanted the British public to believe that Americans were ignorant half-savages, incapable of ruling themselves. That was an easy doctrine to preach. But how could it be reconciled with the fact that these Mohawks had produced the world's greatest scientist? Simply by playing the role that was thrust upon him, Franklin became a living plea for his countrymen. The British ministry decided that he was entirely too clever; they changed their tactics and tried to destroy him. But by this time Franklin's reputation was so well established that their great attack against him, delivered by the solicitor general in person, had the air of being a deliberate persecution; it won him more friends than it lost. Those friends were not without power in British politics. Their influence helps to explain the half-hearted tactics of the British armies during the Revolution.

In France, where he represented his country from 1776 to 1785, Franklin was also the great man of science, but he played a second role that was even more important. He was the perfect type of middle-class virtue, the arch-bourgeois. Voltaire and Rousseau had also attempted that role; but Voltaire had aimed too high, making himself the Count of Ferney; and Rousseau, insisting that he was a simple watchmaker, had aimed too low. At this point I am copying Bernard Faÿ, who explained that Franklin had found the happy medium. He was a bourgeois and quite deliberately he dressed the part, going to court "without wig or sword, in brown velvet, white hose, his hair hanging loose, his spectacles on his nose and a white hat under his arm." The bourgeoisie was highly favored in those days before the bourgeois revolution; and Franklin's face appeared in thousands upon thousands of reproductions. The king got so tired of hearing him praised by Diane de Polignac that he gave her a chamber pot of Sèvres china with Franklin's face in the bottom of it. But the king too was deeply impressed. Indeed, when you read this latest biography of Franklin, you wonder whether any other American could have negotiated the treaty of alliance with France.

We owe a considerable debt to Carl Van Doren for writing a full-length, scholarly life that incorporates the latest researches into Franklin's long career.[1] There is no doubt that he has been neglected of recent years, not by historical students, who have continued to unearth new facts about him, but rather by literary fashion and by the public at large. There are signs that Franklin is ceasing to be a hero of the nation that he did more, perhaps, than any other single man to conceive and unite and launch on its career. The trouble is of course another mask, Poor Richard of "The Way to Wealth," the role in which he is best re-

HATHITRUST.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

membered by his own countrymen. Poor Richard has made him the patron saint of thrift societies, building-and-loan associations and moss-backed Republican bankers who would be outraged to hear that they were quoting the maxims of a free-thinker, an easygoing libertine and a revolutionary democrat. Says Mr. Van Doren at the end of his preface, "The dry, prim people seem to regard him as a treasure shut up in a savings bank to which they have the lawful key. I herewith give him back, in his grand dimensions, to his nation and the world."

His book has already been nominated by several critics for the Pulitzer Prize, and I should like to add my vote to theirs. Among all the lives of Franklin, it is the longest and best informed, and I doubt that any other biography of the year will be as useful. But there is a fault or limitation in the plan of the book that keeps it from telling a complete story. Mr. Van Doren explains in his preface that Franklin is known chiefly from his "Autobiography," and is therefore insufficiently known, since that work stops short with his middle years. Franklin had always intended to write about his later life. The materials he would have used are still available, in his journals, letters and miscellaneous writings. "Here at last they have been drawn together and arranged in something like the order he might have given them. . . . In effect, Franklin's autobiography is here completed."

But is a new autobiography of Franklin what we really want or need in the twentieth century? It seems to me that in order to know the man "in his grand dimensions," we have to see him in perspective, against the background of his times, and this is a view that Mr. Van Doren fails to give. As compared with Bernard Faÿ's "Franklin," published in 1929, his book is sounder at many points but conspicuously lacking in general ideas. He has written a behavioristic biography, one that tells us "what Franklin did, said, thought and felt," one that describes the successive roles he assumed. But how can we understand those roles, or their effect, without knowing the theatres where they were played and the audiences that hissed or applauded them?

MALCOLM COWLEY

A History of Writing

The March of Literature, by Ford Madox Ford. New York: The Dial Press. 895 pages. $3.75.

THIS IS THE BOOK of an old man mad about writing—in the sense that Hokusai called himself an old man mad about painting." So much, and no more, Ford Madox Ford claims for himself in his introduction to "The March of Literature," and it would scarcely be possible for words more concisely to convey the personal and passionate quality of this history of the imaginative literature of the world. The book is tolerant, generous, large and, like the literature of which it treats, humane.

Written for the common reader, it will excite him alternately to admiration and annoyance. It can hardly leave him unmoved. He will find, whatever his complexion, any number of statements to cavil at; he will wonder at the inaccuracies, which are not many, but which when they occur seem due, never to ignorance, but always to a perverse invention. Why, for instance, should Mr. Ford, who was the Rossettis in his own family, assert against all conjecture that Guido Cavalcanti was forty years older than Dante? But of dullness, none will complain. And in the praise, all will, I think, concur. For Mr. Ford reminds us that it is the proudest privilege of the critic to praise, provided he can come on the proper words and reasons for his praise.

The reasons which Mr. Ford finds for praise are always his own. His preference is for order and restraint in writing, in content, for the ordinary; and hence, perhaps, he is least satisfactory with those among the great who, like Shakespeare, depend for their effects largely upon a penetrative passion and an excess of the sensual imagination. But Mr. Ford has read everything worth reading and much that is commonly considered unreadable by any but the specialist getting up a subject. At one point he says that he supposes himself to be "the only man alive who can make the claim to have—in his hotter youth—read right through the voluminous and insufferable 'Artaxerxes' of Mme. de Scudéry (1607-1701) or the even heavier and longer 'Grand Cyrus.'" He knows Latin and Greek and has made French, Provençal, Italian, Spanish and German his own; where, as in Chinese, Russian and Hebrew, he has had to depend upon translations, he has always been in touch with someone who could command the classics of those languages in the original. He has read as only a man long mad about writing could read—without thought of extraneous rewards. He holds that the end of literature is to improve us, not by promoting this or that party, not by promulgating this or that opinion—though these are things which literature on occasion has done without ceasing to be itself—but by so increasing insight, by so sustaining with delight, that we are left more truly humane. The quality of literature is the quality of humanity, so that its history must, in the long run, become a history of what man has known and felt about himself.

To write his history, Mr. Ford returns to that method of narration which he worked out, a good many years ago, with Joseph Conrad for their common use in fiction. He has told us all about that before. But in the present volume he reminds us that they were not the first to discover it and that long ago Herodotus found it advantageous for history. Its great trick is the time shift. Its convenience is that it relieves the narrator from any necessity of following the temporal sequence of events; he can place them in what order he likes. It allows Mr. Ford to consider any writer at his choice, which may be to set him far out of his country and century. Thus, Homer is mentioned in his proper place in Greek letters; he is not discussed until Mr. Ford has come to Rome, where his masterly presence serves to show up the shortcomings of even the most famous Augustans. Voltaire is compared with Confucius. And the Spanish picaresque novelists are so portrayed that in time their salient features are seen to have been inherited, not by their compatriots, but by French and English grandsons.

That Mr. Ford would use this method with great skill and tact could have been foreseen. Here, it discloses an unexpected advantage. It allows him to show how the effort to make of man a creature more truly humane has been common to the whole of mankind. No one race has a hold on wisdom; there is none, now at least, which does not owe

LICENSED TO NNZ ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been long ages of agony and short periods of calm, and agony and calm have alike produced great writing; but this much it does seem possible to say: that only where there is a general effort to create for civilization circumstances more humane will the writer arrive who can succeed in saying with words what has been silently, and it may be unsuccessfully, done. Civilization and humanity, of course, are not the same; and when they conflict there is never much doubt where literature will be found.

The impressionistic method, however, is not without its weaknesses and these become more apparent as "The March of Literature" goes on. What happens to Mr. Ford's book, when it enters the nineteenth century, is very much what happened to impressionism in painting between, say, Manet's "Olympia" and the "Water Lilies" of Monet: discipline is lost and something, still skillful, but very like self-indulgence, takes its place. It is true that now the great streams he has long followed divide. But the currents still run and they are stronger and deeper than he lets us know. And the contemporary country is not so flat as he makes it appear on his map, from which he has removed almost all the heights. It may be, of course, that he has been around that country so often that he no longer finds any satisfaction in talking about it. But it is odd to find Mr. Ford writing a history of the literature that is closest to our own day and leaving out, not the names of its greatest writers, but in so many cases everything but their names. JOHN PEALE BISHOP

Anatomy of a City

New York Panorama, compiled and edited by the Federal Writers' Project of the Works Progress Administration for New York. New York: Random House. 538 pages. $2.50.

ANYONE who has had occasion to do much reading in the general history of New York City will know how sketchily and in how oddly capricious a fashion that history has been documented. In the Public Library, you will find a vast number of books about the city's quainter side, and an equal number of others dealing with the more dramatic aspects of its past—the one illustrated, of course, with excessively sun-struck pencil drawings of that lamp post on Minetta Lane and those clapboarded houses on Weehawken Street, the other with pictures of the Astor Place Theatre Riot and the Great Blizzard of '88, reproduced from Currier & Ives or Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly. There are boosterish brochures extolling the spiritual and physical magnificences of the city at whatever period they happened to be written, from 1850 onwards, and sanctimonious essays decrying the same. There are others, like DeVoe's "Market Book" and Valentine's compilations, that are solid and instructive.

One characteristic covers the whole bibliography: the more distant the period, the more thoroughly it is documented. As the town lost simplicity and quaintness, grew more powerful, practical and complex, its chroniclers seem largely to have lost interest in it. The result is that though there is endless information to be had about just where the Tea Water Pump or the Wishing Bridge stood, and by dozens of authors with great thoroughness, the periods that saw the city's emergence as a great metropolis have been hardly glanced at, and the present book is about the first serious attempt to anatomize the city in its present functioning that I know of.

It does it in perhaps the only way the job could have been done, by dividing the city into its separate intersecting worlds and analyzing each. Three chapters at the outset—one purely introductory, another giving the geological and geographical frame, the third briefly summarizing the city's general history—these provide the setting. Then the dissecting begins. Art, literature, music both classical and popular, the theatre and radio are discussed under separate headings, and in each not only are the present manifestations described, but also a concise history is given and an effort made to establish the city's role in that field in relation to the country at large. There is an excellent chapter on the racial components of the population, and another even better on our architecture. The city as seaport, as financial capital and as industrial center is described; its labor history is analyzed.

There are twenty-six chapters in all, and it is probable that in no way save under the auspices of the FWP, with its hundreds of research workers and writers available for the task, could so comprehensive a survey have been carried through. The faults are few. The article on our local press, it seemed to me, could have been expanded and made more interesting; that on the New York dialect was particularly disappointing, devoting too much space to listing pseudo-Winchellisms and similar slang extravagances and too little to the really absorbing peculiarities of New-Yorkese and Brooklynese.

But in general, and in spite of the diversity of talents applied to the compilation of the book, its tone is remarkably uniform and its manner coherent. Throughout, the approach is realistic. The chapter on architecture not only describes our skyscrapers and typical uptown brownstones and apartment houses, but gives also a view of the slum sections of the city and how they came into being, as well as a thoroughly up-to-date account of the modern efforts in city planning designed to rectify such conditions; the one on Harlem combines a tour of the night spots there with a glimpse of the uneasy racial groups massed behind them. And all this, moreover, is presented uninsistently, untendentiously: indeed, one of the charms of the book is the constant play of its really graceful commentary.

Finally, as all good handbooks should do, it abounds in facts—facts curious or instructive, but always entertaining. From it you will learn that the Woolworth Building was put up because Frank Woolworth saw a postcard in Calcutta, that over 200 species of wild birds still nest in the city, and that last year smuggled drugs to the value of $2,350,000 were seized in the port; that the municipal government employs 155,486 persons, and that the largest garnet crystal ever found in this country was dug out of a ditch on West Thirty-fifth Street . . . and so on.

The book is well indexed, and there are something like a hundred photographs. With the more detailed "City Guide," which is still to appear, as its companion volume, the book is certain to be immensely informative both to out-of-town visitors and to native New Yorkers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Behind War in China

Imperial Japan: 1926-1938, by A. Morgan Young. New York: William Morrow and Company. 328 pages. $3.
The Real Conflict Between China and Japan, by Harley Farnsworth MacNair. The University of Chicago Press. 232 pages. $2.

THE NEWSPAPER READER who has been following the Sino-Japanese war in the press has little opportunity to see present events in the light of long-range political developments. The material presented by Mr. Young furnishes precisely this background. As editor of The Japan Chronicle the author was in a position to see political phenomena and events of the last decade from the inside. There were innumerable items which had come to his knowledge and had to disappear in the drawer of his editorial desk because their publication was not considered opportune. Now Mr. Young opens his files.

As a result, this volume is enlightening. Its chief asset, indeed, is the collection of details which may shed a human light on many political news stories, though in their Asiatic bizarreness they are often incredible. There is much timely and unusual information on "Thought" cases, which the Japanese authorities handled with shocking brutality. In the chapter on "Bigger and Better Murders," Mr. Young presents the details of a political neurosis which is utterly strange from the point of view of the newspaperman who has a professional respect for facts. It was depressing to learn that "the dread of truth is a phenomenon found all over the world, but seldom in such strength and abundance as in modern Japan."

But this book goes beyond the purely factual aspects of Japan's push to power. The history of the last twelve years, starting with the opening of the present Showa era, is summed up. The tragic failure of the peaceful and compromising ("spineless") Shidehara policy, the forces pressing toward the conquest of Manchuria, the events leading up to the present holocaust, are written with the newspaperman's flair for the essential. Developments inside Japan are accompanied by accounts of what was going on in China. Thus, Japan's present war of conquest and aggression can be seen in its historic importance to both countries.

Throughout the book, the author seems to have an intimate knowledge of things Japanese. Beneath the surface of accusation and criticism, there are warm sympathy and understanding, and also a tone of deep personal disappointment. This mixture of keen observation and emotional reaction makes the book a document of both human and historic importance.

Professor MacNair, in his study of the Far Eastern mind, realizes that "confusion in this area is largely the outcome of conflicts in civilizations and cultures accompanied by struggles between physical realities and moral susceptibilities." In a thoughtful and entertaining study, the author goes into the psychology of both warring nations, supporting his analysis with bits of historical and political background. He explains *why* the Chinese is dilatory, and *why* the Japanese tends to jump the gun. Emphasizing the profound cultural difference between East and West, he finds it "amazing" that the greater part of Western [illegible]

POWER

A NEW SOCIAL ANALYSIS

By Bertrand Russell

From John Chamberlain's Feature Review in THE NEW REPUBLIC'S Fall Book Number—

"BERTRAND RUSSELL'S book is fresh, stimulating, wholly unorthodox. And it leads to one conclusion: economic self-interest is not necessarily the fundamental motive in the social sciences, as both the classical economists and Marx have assumed."

"IT WOULD be hard to imagine a more timely book. It is, however, much more than a book of the hour. It is likely to prove one of those germinal works that introduce new viewpoints and methods into general use."—*Ernest Sutherland Bates* in the *N. Y. Herald Tribune.*

"A VOLUME not merely brilliant but noble in its argument. His readers will not need to be told that they will find here a prose extraordinarily lucid and effortless, marked by constant flashes of wit and insight."—*Henry Hazlitt* in a front page feature review of the *N. Y. Times.* $3.00

THE ANATOMY OF REVOLUTION

By Crane Brinton

"IT IS legitimate to ask whether the Nazi movement, though headed in a different direction from most other revolutions, is not somehow similar to them or at least subject to certain similar influences. Mr. Brinton's excellent book would seem to show that it is. Even the German people won't stay at a butterless pitch of Nazi enthusiasm forever. If another revolution doesn't reach them first, Thermidor will," is the reaction of Ralph Thompson in the *N. Y. Times* to this fruitful examination of uniformities apparent in the great revolutions of 1642, 1776, 1789 and 1917. $3.00

"Books that Live"

W. W. NORTON & COMPANY
70 FIFTH AVENUE • NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A true companion to his great "Autobiography"

Revealing a new Steffens —the man as he was, not as he thought he was

The Letters of Lincoln Steffens

Edited by Ella Winter and Granville Hicks
With a Memorandum by Carl Sandburg

So much is here that is not in "The Autobiography!" For Steffens wrote incomparably revealing and intimate letters throughout his life. This full and fascinating collection is alive with that complex and irrepressible Steffens personality, and it gives a fresh close-up view of the panorama of American history which Steffens observed for half a century.

2 vols., boxed, with many photographs, $10.00

Only a millionaire could afford NOT *to own this book!*

IT'S AN ART

ADVERTISING AND ADVERTISED PRODUCTS

by HELEN WOODWARD

The tricks in advertising are played on YOU! You owe it to yourself and your income to read this inside story of the advertising world. Here's priceless information about everything you buy, about the techniques and policies of advertising, all written good-naturedly by a woman who is an advertising expert and knows what she's talking about. $2.75

Anne Morrow Lindbergh's

Listen! the Wind

". . . the full adventure of pioneer flying . . . a full measure of human life."
—Katherine Woods, N. Y. Times

With a Foreword and Maps by Charles A. Lindbergh, $2.50

HARCOURT, BRACE AND COMPANY
383 Madison Avenue, New York

have survived their transplanting. This brilliant little book will be of service to those who want to know the broader issues behind the present conflict. ERNEST O. HAUSER

The Revolutionary Governess

The Buccaneers, by Edith Wharton. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. $2.50.

EDITH WHARTON had been working on this novel during the last four or five years of her life, but died before she was able to finish it. The first section has a certain brilliance. It is concerned with the children of the *nouveaux riches* at Saratoga during the seventies, when the post-Civil War fortunes were rolling up, and it makes a counterpart to the picture in "The Age of Innocence" of the older well-to-do New Yorkers of this period. It all comes back rather diminished in memory but in lively and charming colors, like a slide in one of those magic lanterns which are mentioned as a contemporary form of entertainment: the pretty girls who are not in society but who get so much attention from the young men, while their parents try to prevent them from running wild, in the atmosphere of the Saratoga race track and the old Grand Union Hotel.

Later, she takes her Americans to London and has the girls make what are regarded by their parents as highly successful marriages with men of the aristocracy and of the rich industrial middle class. But Edith Wharton was never anything like so good when she was dealing with French or English society as she was with the United States; and this part of "The Buccaneers," even allowing for the fact that a good deal of it was left in the form of an unworked-over first draft, seems banal and perhaps a shade trashy. Also, the mellowness of Mrs. Wharton's later years here as elsewhere dulled the sharpness of her fiction. There are passages in "The Buccaneers" which read like an old-fashioned story for girls.

Something more interesting appears in her scenario for the unfinished part of the tale. In this last novel, Edith Wharton has more or less reversed the values of her embittered "Custom of the Country": instead of playing off the culture and tradition of Europe against the vulgar rich Americans, who are insensible to them, she dramatizes the climbing young ladies as a revivifying and air-clearing force. But in the last pages she wrote, she made it plain that the hard-boiled commercial elements which were on the rise in both civilizations, representing fundamentally the same thing, were to understand each other perfectly. In what was to follow, the English governess who has helped to engineer the success of the Americans and who is the child of Italian revolutionaries and a cousin of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, was to have sacrificed her own hopes of capturing an amateur esthete of the older generation of the nobility by aiding his son to elope with the most interesting of the American girls. Nan St. George has sensibility and generous instincts, but she is married to a dreary English duke, who has confined her in the routine of his castle but who does not understand her interest in trying to improve the living conditions of the tenantry. Her elopement with the only one of the young Englishmen who has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

represented a triumph of all that was most vital in human feeling and culture, as Mrs. Wharton understood them, over the coldness and decadence of the aristocratic past and the crassness of the commercial present. In order to secure this triumph, Miss Testvalley, the governess, was to have let herself in for spending the rest of her days amid the poverty and dullness of her home, where the old revolution had died.

Miss Testvalley is much the best thing in the book; and there is a peculiar appropriateness and felicity in the fact that Edith Wharton should have left as the last human symbol of her fiction this figure who embodies the revolutionary principle implicit in all her work. As the light of her art grows dim and goes out before she has finished this last novel, the image still lingers on our retina of the large dark eyes of the clever spinster, who, like her creator, in trading in worldly values, has given a rebuff to the values of the world; in following a destiny solitary and disciplined, has fought a campaign for what, in that generation, would have been called the rights of the heart.

EDMUND WILSON

New Books: A Reader's List

THE MAN IN EUROPE STREET, by Rupert Croft-Cooke (Putnam, $2.75). The author tours Europe in a circus truck, shortly before the Austrian invasion, to get the opinion of the average "man in the street" toward fascism, and finds that all is for the best in the best of possible worlds. Interviews with a Candide camera.

THE HIRED MAN ON HORSEBACK, by May Davison Rhodes (Houghton Mifflin, $3). His widow does the biography of the late Eugene Manlove Rhodes, who was a cowboy himself when he took to writing his very popular stories about the Wild West. Bernard DeVoto contributes a long, appreciative essay on the work of Rhodes.

DOCTOR BRADLEY REMEMBERS, by Francis Brett Young (Reynal and Hitchcock, $2.75). An English country doctor looks back on his career, which has interest mainly for its picture of medicine when antiseptics were still in the kindergarten stage.

THE DISSENTING OPINIONS OF MISTER WESTBROOK PEGLER (Scribner's, $2.50). Eighty-five selections from Pegler's more recent columns in the Scripps-Howard papers. Some of them are delightful and many of them are buffle-headed, but all of them are so good and fast as writing that it seems a pity the man never learned to read.

THE DOOR OF LIFE, by Enid Bagnold (Morrow, $2.50). Nursery-novel about a well-to-do, womany household into which a fifth baby is born to the tune of cloying cadenced womb-writing (by the author of "National Velvet"). Includes many howlers about childbirth and family—". . . a group loose-knit and close-knit, running at the end of faint elastic ropes, but tied still to her navel."

FIRST THE BLADE, by May Merrill Miller (Knopf, $3). Long, sympathetic novel of a woman who went from the Civil War in Missouri to the settling of the San Joaquin Valley in California. The col- [illegible]

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN
recommends——

"As a novel, *The Liberals* is good in pretty nearly every way. The issues are vital; they are the deep challenging ones that stare every one of us in the face during practically every one of our waking hours. Mr. Preston writes with solid impact. But for all his courage and aptness and skill I still want to pick a fight with him over his definition of the word liberal . . . That definition gives form and movement and climax to a fine, exhilarating novel. It also inadvertently raises the question: must the good old word be drummed out of the lexicon of modernism merely because some self-styled liberals act in an illiberal way?"
$2.50

The Liberals

a novel by JOHN HYDE PRESTON

and—

"Professor Counts' *The Prospects of American Democracy* is no mere defense of liberalism or democracy as a negative 'middle way.' It is, on the contrary, a heady call to action, complete with program and ideological ammunition. As Professor Counts says, democracy has always been the most venturesome of creeds; it has positive values of its own, and it demands faith and intransigence no less than communism or fascism . . . By implication, *The Prospects of American Democracy* is addressed to intellectuals who have been so bedazzled by Marxist theory that they have ceased forthwith to do any original thinking of their own."
$3.00

GEORGE S. COUNTS'

The Prospects of American Democracy

JOHN DAY BOOKS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heroines have kissed the Rebel boys goodbye in 1861 to be distinctive any longer for just a pretty face and courage.

WHAT'S IN IT FOR ME? by Jerome Weidman (Simon and Schuster, $2). A sequel to "I Can Get It for You Wholesale," with many of the same characters and situations. The author writes with less high pressure and more doubt, or perhaps only seems to because the subject is now familiar. Anyway, it's a book to read.

DEAD NED, by John Masefield (Macmillan, $2.50). A yarn of the eighteenth century, with the young doctor-hero accused of the murder of his sea-captain benefactor, hanged at Newgate, resurrected from the dead by two doctors, and sent on his way on a slave trader bound for Africa. Reads well, and will be continued in Mr. Masefield's next.

Contributors

H. N. BRAILSFORD is the London correspondent for The New Republic.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, co-author of "Merchants of Death," has been traveling extensively in Europe for several months and is now at work on a book, "Preview to War" (Modern Age Books).

HENRY C. WOLFE is the author of "The German Octopus" and has contributed to many magazines, including The New Republic, on Central European affairs.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN is professor of Political Science at Williams College. He is working on a diplomatic history of Europe since 1933 (Alfred A. Knopf).

GEORGE SELDES has studied and written extensively on the American press. His "Lords of the Press" is to be published by Julian Messner on October 26.

SAMUEL SLAFF is legislative counsel for the New York Civil Liberties Committee and was counsel for the Workers' Defense League in the Lovell v. Griffin case, where the Supreme Court for the first time declared limitations on the right of handbill distribution to be unconstitutional.

JOHN PEALE BISHOP is the author of two books of verse and a novel, "Act of Darkness."

ERNEST O. HAUSER has recently returned from a visit to the Far East. He is the author of "The Rest of the World."

ROBERT M. COATES, author of "Yesterday's Burdens" and "The Outlaw Years," is The New Yorker's art critic.

$100.00 IN CASH PRIZES

FOR CONSTRUCTIVE COMMENT ON THE BOOK "GOUGE"

with suggestions that will aid in speedy accomplishment of its objectives.

THIS BOOK advocates life insurance reform—simpler policies, more safety, lower costs, Government control. Also advises some non-lapsing insurance on every American citizen, backed by Government, so that NO citizen's death will leave dependents immediately destitute.

READ "GOUGE" first. Then write me your suggestions. Literary style not essential. Constructive ideas count. Letters must be mailed by December 15th. Prizes awarded promptly and paid as follows: 1st prize, $50; 2nd prize, $25; 3rd prize, $10; next three, $5 each.

"GOUGE" will help you with your insurance problems —may save you a lot of money. Send me $1.50 for cloth-bound or $1.00 for paperbound (plus 3% sales tax in California), and a copy will be mailed postpaid.

AID THE CRUSADE FOR INSURANCE REFORM

J. F. GASKILL, *Publisher* Box 5600, METRO STATION LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

For Those Interested In

LAY SCHOLARSHIP

Dr. SIDNEY HOOK.....*Logic of Social Inquiry*
Dr. ERNEST NAGEL.....*Philosophy of Science*
Dr. MARK GRAUBARD.....*Social Biology*
Dr. ALEXANDER LESSER....*Contemporary Anthropology*

All courses are $15 for the academic year of 15 sessions. Catalogue will be mailed upon request. For further information call or write Educational Department, Y. M. H. A.—Lexington Ave. at 92nd Street. ATwater 9-2400.

20 WEDNESDAY EVENINGS MOTION PICTURE PARADE

A Film Appreciation series of specially selected films, old and new, domestic and foreign, fictional and documentary, silent and sound. Series begins Oct. 19. Free illustrated folder upon request.

Highly interesting and instructive discussions by actors, directors, critics, and writers including:

VICKI BAUM — JOHN D. CRAIG
GILBERT SELDES — JIM TULLY
SOO YONG — PAUL GREEN
HARRISON FORMAN — JOHN ABBOTT
M. J. ADLER — DEANE DICKASON

Subscription for Entire Series of 20—$7.50

Division of Film Study, University Extension
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Rand School Forum of Current Events

OCTOBER 20th, 8:30 P. M.
Second in Series on the European Crisis
HAROLD BUTCHER, Editor "Foreign Press"
England and Europe's Balance of Power
Single, 25c — Series, 5 for $1.00
7 East 15th Street, New York City

FUTURE OF AMERICAN MEDICINE

Symposium presented by the Interne Council of America
Chairman: **Robert F. Wagner, Jr.**
Speakers: **Dr. J. P. Peters, Dr. P. I. Nash,** and others
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, at 8:00 P. M.
HOTEL CENTER, 108 West 43rd Street
TICKETS: 40c at door

SCOTT NEARING, Tuesday evening, October 25, "The Doddering British Empire," Thomas Paine Society Hall, 88—7th Ave., South, Manhattan; 8:30 p. m. Admission 40c.

GEN. VICTOR A. YAKHONTOFF, speaks on "SOVIET RUSSIA AND ITS ALLIES,"

LICENSED TO MECC BY NZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THEATRE

"Sends you into the night rejoicing."—*Whipple, World-Tel.*
MAX GORDON
(In association with George S. Kaufman & Moss Hart) *presents*
SING OUT THE NEWS
Music & Lyrics by HAROLD ROME
Conceived & Directed by CHARLES FRIEDMAN
MUSIC BOX TH. 45th Street West of Broadway, Evenings 8:40 — Matinees Thursday & Saturday at 2:40 —

CLASSIFIED RATE:
One line of 6 point type (6 words) 40c;
One line of 5 point type (7-8 words) 33 1/3c.
NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49th Street, New York, N. Y.

POSITION WANTED

COLLEGE GRADUATE; young; history; pedagogy; interested teaching; salary secondary. Address Box 13, The New Republic.

FOR RENT

NEATLY FURNISHED small studido, completely separate entrance. $20 monthly. Call evenings. Lobel, 352 East 19th St., N. Y. C.

EXPEDITION

GROUP GOING TO GUATEMALA next summer to survey native life and the ancient Mayan civilization. Reservations must be made now. Box 100, The New Republic, or call GRamercy 5-4711.

PERSONAL

DOES informal discussion of current, cultural topics in sociable group interest you? Address: Box 101, The New Republic.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB

HAPPINESS CIRCLE, the best anodyne for the lack of camaraderie. Enclose stamped envelope for details. Dept. W., Box 107, Grand Central Annex, New York.

LITERARY HELP

THESIS WORK, RESEARCH PAPERS. Special Articles, Addresses, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly, serviceable results. Over twenty years consistent service to patrons. AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Classroom subscription rate to
THE NEW REPUBLIC
25c a month per student
for orders of 10 or more copies to one address. Desk copies free.
THE NEW REPUBLIC